arXiv:1607.08835v2 [math.AG] 7 Dec 2016

Fine compactified moduli of enriched structures on stable curves

Owen Biesel and David Holmes

December 8, 2016

Abstract

Enriched structures on stable curves over fields were defined by Maino in the late 1990s, and have played an important role in the study of limit linear series and degenerating jacobians. In this paper we solve three main problems: we give a definition of enriched structures on stable curves over arbitrary base schemes, and show that the resulting fine moduli problem is representable; we show that the resulting object has a universal property in terms of Néron models; and we construct a compactification of our stack of enriched structures.

Contents

1 Introduction **3**
1.1 Future work on the closure of the double ramification cycle 5
1.2 Special case of 2-gons 6
1.3 Some of the complications arising in the general case 7
1.3.1 Graphs make no sense 7
1.3.2 What if the graph is not circuit–connected? 7
1.3.3 How to pull back as the graph changes? 8
1.4 Why do we bother with non-compactified enriched structures? . . . 8
1.5 Acknowledgements 9

I Fine moduli of enriched structures **9**

2 Defining enriched structures **9**
2.1 Background 9
2.1.1 Graphs 9

2.1.2 Curves . . . 10
2.2 What we mean by 'a curve' . . . 11
2.3 The largest open on which a graph makes sense . . . 12
2.4 Enriched structures on controlled curves . . . 14
2.5 Pulling back enriched structures . . . 16
2.6 Enriched structures for general C/S . . . 20

3 Representability of the functor of enriched structures 23
3.1 Example . . . 23
3.2 Glueing . . . 24

4 Enriched structures over separably closed fields 28
4.1 The structure of pullbacks of certain ideal sheaves to fibres . . . 30
4.2 Comparing the two notions of enriched structure . . . 33

5 The stack of enriched structures and universal Néron models 34
5.1 Geometric regularity of the stack of enriched structures . . . 36
5.2 $\mathbb{E}$ is an isomorphism . . . 39

II Compactifying the stack of enriched structures 41

6 Defining compactified enriched structures 41
6.1 From relative components to hemispheres . . . 42
6.2 Enrichment data . . . 43
6.3 Local structure of pullbacks of ideal sheaves again . . . 44
6.4 Compatibility of enrichment data . . . 48
6.5 Pulling back compactified enriched structures . . . 50
6.6 Compactified enriched structures for general C/S, and properties . . . 51

7 Properness of the stack of compactified enriched structures 54

8 Comparison to enriched structures 58
8.1 When all the labels vanish . . . 60
8.2 Integral base schemes . . . 66
8.3 Deducing the general case . . . 67

A Defining sheaves on a base for a Grothendieck topology 68

1 Introduction

If C/k is a stable curve over an algebraically closed field with irreducible components $C_1, \ldots, C_n$, and $\mathcal{C}/k[[t]]$ is a regular smoothing of C, then the C_i can be thought of as divisors on $\mathcal{C}$, and one defines line bundles $\mathscr{L}_i$ on C by the formula $\mathscr{L}_i = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}(C_i)|_C$. In [Mai98], Maino defined an *enriched structure* on C/k to be a collection of line bundles $\mathscr{L}_1, \ldots, \mathscr{L}_n$ which arise in the above fashion from some regular smoothing of C/k. She gave a more intrinsic characterisation of these enriched structures, and also constructed a coarse moduli space (which we will discuss more later on). Maino's work has played an important role in a number of works on stable curves, such as in Osserman's construction of limit linear series on stable curves [Oss14b], [Oss14a], and work of Esteves, Nivaldo, Salehyan and others on related problems [EM02], [ES07]. In [AP14], Abreu and Pacini study a tropical counterpart of enriched structures, with the explicit hope that it might lead to a modular compactification of the moduli of enriched structures. At the conclusion of her talk at the Summer Research Institute on Algebraic Geometry in Salt Lake City, Caporaso also asked for a compactification of the moduli of enriched structures. The construction of such a compactification is the third of the three main results of this article; we call its points *compactified enriched structures*.

The definition of enriched structure given above only applies to a stable curve over an algebraically closed field, and so the notion of 'moduli of enriched structures' is rather awkward. Writing $\bar{M}_g$ for the coarse moduli space of stable curves of genus g, Maino constructs a scheme $E_g \to \bar{M}_g$ and for each k-point p of $\bar{M}_g$ (corresponding to a curve C/k) gives a bijection of sets between the set of enriched structures on C/k and the k-points of E_g lying over p. Noting that every stable curve admits at least one enriched structure, it is clear that this $E_g/\bar{M}_g$ is highly non-unique - for example, the disjoint union of the fibres of $E_g \to \bar{M}_g$ has the same property! Now Maino's construction is much more reasonable than this — it is connected and quasi-compact, given as an open subscheme of a certain blowup of $\bar{M}_g$ — but with her definition of enriched structure it is hard to justify why this is a 'good' moduli space. Maino also proposes two definitions of enriched structures over reduced base schemes (neither of which bears any resemblance to our definition), but does not establish whether they are equivalent.

Our first main result is a definition of an enriched structure on a stable curve over an arbitrary base scheme (allowing marked points and more, see definition 2.10). Unfortunately our definition is too involved to spell out in the introduction, though in section 1.2 we will describe the special case of the universal deformation of a 2-pointed 2-gon. We show that our definition reduces to Maino's when the base is a point. We also show that the resulting stack $\mathcal{E}$ over the fine moduli stack $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ is algebraic; better, that $\mathcal{E}$ is relatively representable by an algebraic space over $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$.

Our second main result is to give a universal property for the stack $\mathcal{E} \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ in terms of Néron models of jacobians. We show that the pullback to $\mathcal{E}$ of the universal stable curve $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{g,n}$ is regular. We show that the jacobian of the universal smooth curve $\mathcal{C}_{g,n} \to \mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ admits a Néron model N over $\mathcal{E}$ (in the sense of [Hol14]), and further that $\mathcal{E}$ is universal with respect to this property; more precisely we show that if $t\colon T \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ is a morphism such that $t^*\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{g,n}$ is regular and the jacobian of $t^*\mathcal{C}_{g,n}$ admits a Néron model over T, then $T \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ factors uniquely via $\mathcal{E} \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$.

This relates $\mathcal{E}$ to the 'universal Néron model admitting morphism' constructed in [Hol14] (more precisely, it shows that $\mathcal{E}$ is the 'first level' in the tower of universal Néron model admitting morphisms, see section 5). From this we can deduce for free some nice properties of $\mathcal{E}$:

- $\mathcal{E}$ is regular (non-singular);
- $\mathcal{E} \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ is separated;
- The pullback of Caporaso's balanced Picard stack (cf. [Cap08]) $\mathcal{P}_{d,g}/\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ to $\mathcal{E}$ admits a canonical group/torsor structure (here we need conditions on (d, g) for $\mathcal{P}_{d,g}$ to be defined);
- Let $d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ be a vector of integers with sum zero. Writing $J_{g,n} \to \mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ for the universal jacobian, the dth Abel-Jacobi map is a section $\alpha\colon \mathcal{M}_{g,n} \to J_{g,n}$. Then α extends uniquely to a section $\mathcal{E} \to N$ (recall $N/\mathcal{E}$ is the Néron model of J over $\mathcal{E}$). In section 1.1 we will briefly discuss an application of this to the double ramification cycle.

Alternatively, if one is initially more interested in the Néron models side, then we can view this result as giving an explicit description of the functor of points of $\mathcal{E}$, the first level in the tower of universal Néron model admitting morphisms.

The second part of the paper is devoted to constructing a compactification of $\mathcal{E}$ over $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$. More precisely, we construct a proper relative algebraic space $\bar{\mathcal{E}} \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ and an open immersion $\mathcal{E} \to \bar{\mathcal{E}}$ over $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$. In view of the 'extension of the Abel-Jacobi map' property discussed just above, we plan to use such a compactification to define Gromov-Witten invariants of $B\mathbb{G}_m$ (cf. [FTT16], where 'admissibility' is required). Such a construction will need further work, for example showing that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is regular, so that the intersection theory is well-behaved, and we postpone this to a future paper.

The definition of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is again too involved to describe in this introduction, but we can nonetheless outline the main differences from $\mathcal{E}$. As in Maino's original construction, our definition of an enriched structure includes certain invertible sheaves. When moving to $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$, these are unsurprisingly replaced by torsion free

rank 1 sheaves (see definition 6.1). However, there is a substantial complication. Maino's definition (spelled out in definition 4.2) gives an invertible sheaf for each irreducible component of C/k satisfying certain combinatorial conditions, and requires that the tensor product of all these invertible sheaves together be trivial. In our more general definition of an enriched structure a similar condition remains; at some point the tensor product of certain invertible sheaves is required to be trivial. When replacing the invertible sheaves by torsion free rank 1 sheaves this no longer makes much sense, since if a tensor product of sheaves is trivial then they were by definition invertible! We thus replace the 'tensor product is trivial' condition by a rather more involved condition in terms of certain auxiliary data (see definition 6.13). We must then work quite hard to verify that, in the case of invertible sheaves, this reduces to the original definition.

1.1 Future work on the closure of the double ramification cycle

Given the connection between moduli of enriched structures and Néron models, it is perhaps unsurprising that the moduli of enriched structures is relevant in the study of the closure of the double ramification cycle. Given a tuple of n integers summing to zero, one constructs a section α to the universal jacobian over $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ by taking the formal linear combination of the tautological sections with the given integers as coefficients, and viewing this as a divisor on the universal curve. The double ramification cycle on $\mathcal{M}_{g,n}$ is constructed by pulling back the unit section in the universal jacobian along the section α described above. One then wishes to extend this cycle to $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ in a natural way, and to compute its class in the tautological ring. On the locus of curves with at most one non-separating node the above definition extends in a natural way, and the class was computed by Gruschevsky and Zakharov [GZ14], extending work of Hain [Hai13] who treated the compact-type case. A different approach using virtual fundamental classes on a space of stable maps to a 'rubber $\mathbb{P}^1$' allows for the construction of an extension of the double ramification cycle to the whole of $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$, and its class was computed in [JPPZ16]. Cavalieri, Marcus and Wise verified ([CMW12], [MW13]) that on the locus of curves of compact type this definition in terms of stable maps to rubber $\mathbb{P}^1$ coincides with the original definition in terms of sections to the universal jacobian. In future work, we plan to extend this result to the whole of $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ using a (slightly modified) moduli stack of enriched structures to provide a space where the section α will always extend. It was suggested in [CMW12, §1.5] that such a construction should be carried out, but to our knowledge this has not yet happened.

1.2 Special case of 2-gons

In this section we gently introduce the definition of enriched structure (and compactified enriched structure) by considering the case of a curve with two irreducible components, meeting in two points, whose dual graph is thus a 2-gon.

We work over a separably closed field k — no subtleties are missed by taking $k = \mathbb{C}$. Let C_0 be the curve over k constructed by taking two copies of $\mathbb{P}^1$, glueing the points $(0:1)$ together, and the points $(1:0)$ together, and finally marking both points $(1:1)$. We have a stable 2-pointed curve of genus 1. Let $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ be its universal deformation as a pointed curve, and choose an isomorphism $\mathcal{M} \cong \operatorname{Spec} k[[x,y]]$ such that the locus in $\mathcal{M}$ where $\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{M}$ is not smooth is given by $xy = 0$.

The curve C_0 is the fibre over the closed point of $\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{M}$, and so its two irreducible components give closed subschemes of $\mathcal{C}$. If Γ is the dual graph of C_0/k (a 2-gon), let u and v be its vertices, corresponding to the two irreducible components of C_0. Let $Z(u)$ (resp. $Z(v)$) be the corresponding closed subschemes of $\mathcal{C}$, and write $\mathcal{I}_u$ (resp. $\mathcal{I}_v$) for their ideal sheaves on $\mathcal{C}$.

Now let $s\colon S \to \mathcal{M}$ be any scheme over $\mathcal{M}$. If $\mathcal{C}_S$ is the pullback of $\mathcal{C}$ to a stable curve over S, then $s^*\mathcal{I}_u$ and $s^*\mathcal{I}_v$ are coherent sheaves on $\mathcal{C}_S$. We define an *enriched structure on* $\mathcal{C}_S/S$ to be a pair

$$(q_u\colon s^*\mathcal{I}_u \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_u, q_v\colon s^*\mathcal{I}_v \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_v)$$

of invertible quotients of the $s^*\mathcal{I}_-$, satisfying the condition that $\mathscr{L}_u \otimes \mathscr{L}_v$ is S-locally isomorphic to the trivial bundle on $\mathcal{C}_S$.

For example, suppose $S \to \mathcal{M}$ factors via the complement of the closed point. Then clearly $s^*\mathcal{I}_u$ and $s^*\mathcal{I}_v$ are both trivial, hence so are $\mathscr{L}_u$ and $\mathscr{L}_v$, so there is exactly one enriched structure on $\mathcal{C}_S/S$. On the other hand, if $S \to \mathcal{M}$ factors via the inclusion of the closed point, then there is a bijection between enriched structures on $\mathcal{C}_S/S$ and $\mathbb{G}_m(S)$. The reader will then not be surprised to know that the moduli space $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{M}$ of enriched structures can be obtained by blowing up $\mathcal{M}$ at the closed point, then deleting the two points where the strict transforms of the coordinate axes meet the exceptional fibre.

If the moduli space of enriched structures is open in the blowup of $\mathcal{M}$ at the closed point, one might hope that the moduli of compactified enriched structures is simply the blowup of $\mathcal{M}$ at the origin, and indeed this is the case. To define the functor of compactified enriched structures, one takes pairs

$$(q_u\colon s^*\mathcal{I}_u \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_u, q_v\colon s^*\mathcal{I}_v \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_v)$$

of torsion free rank 1 (see definition 6.1) quotients of the $s^*\mathcal{I}_-$, and imposes a compatibility condition. To define the latter, denote by σ_u (resp. σ_v) the tautological section of $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ through $Z(u)$ (resp. $Z(v)$). We write $\mathbb{K}_u$ for the kernel

of the map $\sigma_u^* s^* \mathcal{I}_u \to \sigma_u^* \mathscr{F}_u$ induced by pulling back q_u along σ_u, and define $\mathbb{K}_v$ similarly. Note that $\sigma_u^* s^* \mathcal{I}_u = s^*(x,y) = \sigma_v^* s^* \mathcal{I}_v$ where (x,y) is the defining ideal of the closed point in $\mathcal{M}$. We then say that the pair $(q_u \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_u \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_u, q_v \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_v \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_v)$ is compatible (i.e. form a compactified enriched structure) if the canonical closed immersion

$$\operatorname{Supp} \frac{s^*(x,y)}{\mathbb{K}_u + \mathbb{K}_v} \to S$$

is an isomorphism (here Supp denote the support of a coherent sheaf). Note that the formation of $\mathbb{K}_u$ and $\mathbb{K}_v$ is stable under base-change by the S-flatness of $\mathscr{F}_u$ and $\mathscr{F}_v$.

Again, if $S \to \mathcal{M}$ factors via the complement of the closed point then the $s^*\mathcal{I}_-$ are both trivial, so $\mathbb{K}_u = \mathbb{K}_v = 0$ and the pair is automatically compatible, so there is exactly one compactified enriched structure. If $S \to \mathcal{M}$ is the inclusion of the closed point then $s^*(x,y)$ is a free k-module of rank 2, $\mathbb{K}_u$ and $\mathbb{K}_v$ are both submodules of rank 1, so that pair is compatible if and only if $\mathbb{K}_u = \mathbb{K}_v$ as submodules of $s^*(x,y)$. More generally we find that the moduli space of compactified enriched structures is naturally isomorphic to the blowup of $\mathcal{M}$ at the closed point.

1.3 Some of the complications arising in the general case

The story told above for the 2-gon was hopefully straightforward (aided by the omission of all the proofs). In this section we outline some of the complications which arise in treating the general case, and how we handle them.

1.3.1 Graphs make no sense

The crucial ideal sheaves $\mathcal{I}_u$ and $\mathcal{I}_v$ were defined in terms of dual graphs and irreducible components, but for arbitrary stable curves neither of these are defined. We begin by defining enriched structures on stable curves C/S such that the tautological map $S \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ factors via an étale chart $U \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ such that the tautological curve C_U/U is 'controlled', i.e. some fibre has a dual graph which dominates the dual graph of all the other fibres. We show the definition is independent of the choice of U. We show that such $S \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ form a base for the big étale site on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ and that the resulting notion of enriched structure forms a sheaf on that base, and hence extends uniquely to a sheaf on the whole of the big étale site. We define this latter sheaf to be the sheaf of enriched structures.

1.3.2 What if the graph is not circuit–connected?

Having one $\mathcal{I}_v$ for each vertex v does not work well if the graph is not circuit-connected (definition 2.3). We work instead with 'relative components' of the

graph, namely pairs (v, G) where v is a vertex and G is a connected component of the complement of v. For example, if the graph has only a single vertex then the set of relative components is empty, so there is exactly one enriched structure (the empty tuple), as one would expect for a smooth curve.

When defining compactified enriched structures this setup is not quite general enough, essentially because of how graphs can change under specialisation (see below). We thus replace relative components with 'hemispheres' of the graph, namely connected subgraphs whose complements are also connected. If (v, G) is a relative component then G is a hemisphere, but not vice-versa in general.

1.3.3 How to pull back as the graph changes?

To define a functor of enriched structures we need a good notion of pullback. However, the dual graph can change dramatically under pullback, as contracting edges may delete loops or break circuit-connectedness. In the case of enriched structures we work around these problems by showing that the set of enriched structures is empty unless the only pullbacks are of a very simple combinatorial shape. In the case of compactified enriched structures our notion of hemispheres allows us to work around this.

1.4 Why do we bother with non-compactified enriched structures?

We will prove that the open substack of compactified enriched structures where the torsion free rank 1 quotients are invertible is canonically isomorphic to the stack of enriched structures. One might reasonably then ask why we bother with a separate definition of enriched structures with its own notion of compatibility. There are several possible answers:

1. The definition of enriched structures is rather simpler and easier to work/compute with than that of compactified enriched structures;

2. The definition of enriched structures is much closer to Maino's original definition;

3. To show that invertible compactified enriched structures over fields are the same as those arising from Maino's definition we would have to do much of the same work as we do in any case comparing enriched structures and invertible compactified enriched structures;

4. For the universal property concerning Néron models, it is much easier to work with enriched structures.

1.5 Acknowledgements

OB would like to thank Raoul Wols for pointing out a valuable reference for the appendix. DH would like to thank Martin Bright for his help in coming up with the definition of compatibility for compactified enriched structures, David Rydh for suggestions on proving representability, and the organisers of the AMS Summer Institute in Algebraic Geometry in Utah for an inspiring conference which provided a lot of motivation and context for this work. Both authors would like to thank Bas Edixhoven for a number of helpful comments and corrections.

Part I
Fine moduli of enriched structures

2 Defining enriched structures

2.1 Background

We start by briefly recalling some definitions from [Hol16a] and [Hol14], where more details can be found.

2.1.1 Graphs

Definition 2.1. A graph is a triple (V, E, ends) where V and E are finite sets (of vertices and edges), and $\text{ends}\colon E \to (V \times V)/\,\mathrm{S}_2$ is a function, which we think of as assigning to each edge the unordered pair of its endpoints. A *loop* is an edge whose endpoints are the same, and a *circuit* is a path of positive length which starts and ends at the same vertex, and which does not repeat any edges or any other vertices.

A morphism of graphs simply contracts some of the edges; more precisely it sends vertices to vertices and edges to either edges or vertices, such that the obvious compatibilities hold.

Definition 2.2. A graph is connected if it has exactly one connected component — in particular, the empty graph is not connected.

Definition 2.3. Let $G = (V, E, \text{ends})$ be a graph. To any subset $E_0 \subseteq E$ we associate the unique subgraph of G with edges E_0 and with no isolated vertices — we will often fail to distinguish between E_0 and the subgraph. We say E_0 is

circuit-connected if for every pair e, e' of distinct edges in E_0 there is at least one circuit $\gamma \subseteq E_0$ such that $e \in \gamma$ and $e' \in \gamma$.

Lemma 2.4 ([Hol14, lemma 7.2])**.** *The maximal circuit-connected subsets of E form a partition of E.*

This partition can be thought of as breaking the graph into loops and 2-vertex-connected components, cf. [Hol14, §7.1].

2.1.2 Curves

Definition 2.5. Let S be an algebraic stack (in the sense of [Sta13, Tag 026O]). A *nodal curve* over S is a proper, flat, finitely presented morphism which is relatively representable by algebraic spaces and whose geometric fibres are reduced, connected, have all irreducible components of dimension 1, and which have at worst nodal singularities.

Given a nodal curve C/S over a scheme, and a geometric point $\bar{s} \to S$, the *graph* Γ of C/S at $\bar{s}$ is defined as in [Liu02, definition 10.3.17]; there is one vertex for each irreducible component of $C_{\bar{s}}$ and for every node an edge connecting the vertices corresponding to the components it lies on. If e is an edge of Γ then we label e by the principal ideal $(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}^{et}_{S,\bar{s}}$ such that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{et}_{C,e} \cong \frac{\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{et}_{S,\bar{s}}[[x,y]]}{(xy-\alpha)}$$

as $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{et}_{S,\bar{s}}$-algebras — see [Hol16a, proposition 2.5].

Definition 2.6. Let C/S be a nodal curve over a scheme, and $\bar{s} \to S$ a geometric point. We say C/S has *normal crossings singularities at* $\bar{s}$ if for every subset E of the edges of the graph $\Gamma_{\bar{s}}$, the closed subscheme of $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}^{et}_{S,\bar{s}}$ cut out by the labels of the edges in E is regular as a scheme, and has codimension equal to the cardinality of E.

We say C/S has *normal crossings singularities* if it has them at all geometric points of S. The notion of having normal crossings singularities is local on S in the smooth topology, so the definition naturally extends to nodal curves C/S where S is an algebraic stack.

Definition 2.7. Let C/S be a nodal curve over a scheme. The *boundary* of C/S is defined as the closed subscheme of S cut out by the annihilator on S of the closed subscheme of C cut out by the first fitting ideal of the sheaf of relative differentials of C/S.

Set-theoretically the boundary consists of those points of S over which C is not smooth. The boundary is locally cut out by a single equation. If C/S has normal crossings singularities then the boundary is a normal crossings divisor, but the converse is not true (think of any generically smooth curve over a trait with more than one singular point on the special fibre).

Definition 2.8. A nodal curve C/S is *quasisplit* if every irreducible component of every fibre is geometrically irreducible, and if the structure morphism $\mathrm{Sing}(C/S) \to S$ of the non-smooth locus is an immersion Zariski-locally on the source.

A nodal curve over a strictly Henselian local scheme is always quasi-split, and by a limiting argument we find that every nodal curve becomes quasi-split after some étale cover. If C/S is quasisplit and $s \in S$ is a point then the graph of C/S at S makes sense, and its labels naturally lie in the Zariski local ring $\mathcal{O}_{S,s}$.

Let C/S be a quasisplit nodal curve. If s, η are two points in S with $s \in \overline{\{\eta\}}$ then we have a natural 'specialisation map' $\Gamma_s \to \Gamma_\eta$ which contracts those edges whose labels become units at η, and replaces the labels on the other edges by their images in the local ring at η.

Definition 2.9. If s, x are two points in S we say x *is controlled by* s if there exists a point $\eta_x \in S$ such that x and s both lie in $\overline{\{\eta_x\}}$ and such that the specialisation map $\Gamma_x \to \Gamma_{\eta_x}$ is an isomorphism. We say s *is a controlling point for* S if every $x \in S$ is controlled by s.

Roughly, this says that every graph of C/S comes with a natural surjection from Γ_s. In the case of the universal deformation of the 2-gon considered in section 1.2, the unique controlling point is the closed point of $\mathcal{M}$.

We usually denote controlling points by fraktur letters.

Suppose C/S has a controlling point $\mathfrak{s} \in S$. Let $\mathfrak{s}'$ be any other controlling point. Then the graphs $\Gamma_\mathfrak{s}$ and $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{s}'}$ are canonically identified, so we have a graph for the whole C/S, without reference to a specific controlling point. If C/S has a controlling point we call it *controlled*, and we call the graph a 'controlling graph'. Every C/S is controlled S-étale locally.

2.2 What we mean by 'a curve'

Definition 2.10. We fix once and for all an algebraic stack $\mathcal{M}$ and a nodal curve $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ with normal crossings singularities. Then for the remainder of the paper, for any scheme S, a *curve over* S will be a morphism $S \to \mathcal{M}$.

Given a curve over S, we obtain a nodal curve C_S/S simply by pulling back $\mathcal{C}$. As such, all the notations and definitions made above can still be applied.

The reader who finds this weird should just think about the case where $\mathcal{M}$ is the stack of stable curves (perhaps with some marked points) over a regular base scheme — we like $\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{Z}$, but everything works just the same if one takes for example $\operatorname{Spec}\mathbb{C}$. Then a 'curve over S' in our sense coincides exactly with a 'stable (pointed) curve over S' in the usual sense. However, note that in our setup the map $S \to \mathcal{M}$ is *not* assumed to be determined by the pullback $\mathcal{C}_S \to S$.

In section 4 we will show that our definition of enriched structure coincides with that of Maino when S is the spectrum of a separably closed field, independent of our choice of $\mathcal{M}$. Maino seems only to discuss the case of stable curves, but (as far as those definitions go) this does not seem to matter.

In summary, almost nothing will be lost by the reader who takes $\mathcal{M}$ to be the stack of stable curves (perhaps of genus g) over $\mathbb{C}$, and such a reader can read 'curve over S' to mean 'stable curve (of genus g) over S' for any scheme S over $\mathbb{C}$, and let the map $S \to \mathcal{M}$ be the tautological map.

2.3 The largest open on which a graph makes sense

Definition 2.11. Let S be a regular scheme and $D = \sum_{i \in I} D_i$ a sum of prime Weil divisors of S. We say D has *simple intersections* if for every subset $J \subseteq I$ we have that every connected component of every étale cover of $\times_{S, j \in J} D_j$ is irreducible.

Note that we do not require the D_i to be distinct.

Lemma 2.12. *Let S be a regular scheme and D a divisor on S.*

1. *Assume D has normal crossings. Then there exists an étale cover*[1] *of S on which D has simple intersections.*

2. *Assume D has simple intersections, and let $f\colon S' \to S$ be étale. Then f^*D has simple intersections.*

Proof.

1. By definition of D having normal crossings, S has an étale cover on which D acquires simple normal crossings; the result is then clear.

2. Immediate from the definition.

□

Definition 2.13. A *simple chart* of $\mathcal{M}$ is an étale map $U \to \mathcal{M}$ where U is a scheme and C_U/U is controlled, and such that the boundary of C_U/U has simple intersections.

[1] By 'étale cover' we always mean an étale surjective morphism.

Let $U \to \mathcal{M}$ be a simple chart and $u \in U$ a point.

Definition 2.14 (Largest open where graph makes sense)**.** Let B be the smallest collection of closed subsets of U satisfying the following properties:

1. $U \in B$;
2. The boundary Δ of C_U/U is in B;
3. B is closed under intersections and taking irreducible components.

Let B_0 be the subset of B consisting of those closed sets which are irreducible. Let U_u be the open subset of U obtained by deleting from U every set in B_0 which does not contain u. Then U_u is an open subset of U since B is finite locally on U. We will refer to this $U_u \subseteq U$ as *the largest open of U where the graph over u makes sense*, which will be justified by the following lemmas.

Example 2.15. If $U = \operatorname{Spec} k[[x, y]]$ is the universal deformation space of a 2-pointed 2-gon (with boundary $xy = 0$), then

- If u is the generic point of U then $U_u = U \setminus (xy = 0)$;
- If u is the generic point of the divisor $(x = 0)$ then $U_u = U \setminus (y = 0)$;
- If u is the closed point of U then $U_u = U$.

Lemma 2.16. *The point u is a controlling point for U_u.*

Proof. Let $x \in U_u$. Let Z be the smallest element of B which contains x. Then Z must be irreducible, so let η be the generic point of Z. By definition $x \in Z$ and $Z \in B_0$, and since $x \in U_u$ we must have $u \in Z$. Thus it suffices to show that the specialisation map $\Gamma_x \to \Gamma_\eta$ is an isomorphism. Suppose it is not; let D be the smallest closed subset of U whose restriction to the local ring at x corresponds to the label of an edge which is contracted. Then $x \in D$ and $\eta \notin D$, contradicting the minimality of Z. □

Lemma 2.17. *Let $f\colon S \to U$ be any morphism and $s \in S$ a controlling point for C_S/S such that $f(s) = u$. Then f factors via $U_u \to U$.*

Proof. Let $x \in S$, then there exists $\eta \in S$ such that x and s both lie in $\overline{\{\eta\}}$ and such that $\gamma\colon \Gamma_x \to \Gamma_\eta$ is an isomorphism. Note that $f(\eta) \in U_u$ since u lies in the closure of the image of η. Now we will show that every element $Z \in B_0$ which contains $f(x)$ also contains $f(\eta)$ and hence contains u, which implies that

$f(x) \in U_u$. Let $Z \in B_0$ contain $f(x)$. Writing D_i for the irreducible components of the boundary Δ, we see that Z contains an irreducible component Z' of

$$\bigcap_{i:x\in D_i} D_i.$$

But since γ is an isomorphism (contracts no edges) we find that also $f(\eta)$ is contained in $\bigcap_{i:x\in D_i} D_i$. But by our 'simple intersections' assumption and the fact that $f(x)$ lies in the closure of $f(\eta)$ we deduce that $f(\eta) \in Z' \subseteq Z$ as required. □

Lemma 2.18. *The pair $(u, U_u \to U)$ is a terminal object in the category of pairs $(s, S \to U)$ where $s \in S$ is a controlling point and $S \to U$ sends s to u.*

Proof. Immediate from the above lemmas. □

Lemma 2.19. *Let u, u' be two points of U such that u specialises to u'. Then $U_u \subseteq U_{u'}$, and if the graph morphism $\Gamma_{u'} \to \Gamma_u$ is an isomorphism, then $U_u = U_{u'}$.*

Thus if η specializes to both u and u', and the map of graphs $\Gamma_u \to \Gamma_\eta$ is an isomorphism, then by two applications of lemma 2.19, we have $U_u \subseteq U_{u'}$.

Proof. For the containment $U_u \subseteq U_{u'}$, note that B_0 consists of closed subsets of U, so if $Z \in B_0$ contains u then it contains u'.

For the second part, if $\Gamma_{u'} \to \Gamma_u$ is an isomorphism then an element of B_0 contains u if and only if it contains u'. □

2.4 Enriched structures on controlled curves

The key objects we will be interested in are curves which are controlled and which admit 'simple étale neighbourhoods'; for example, to define enriched structures we will start by defining them for such curves, then extend formally to the general case (see section 2.6). We thus give them a special name:

Definition 2.20. We say a curve C/S is *simple-controlled* if

1. C/S is controlled (i.e. has a controlling point $\mathfrak{s} \in S$);
2. there exists a factorisation $S \to U \to \mathcal{M}$ where $U \to \mathcal{M}$ is a simple chart (we call this a *simple neighbourhood*).

Note that lemma 2.17 gives that $S \to U$ factors via the open subscheme $U_u \to U$, where u is the image of $\mathfrak{s}$ in U. This is called the *immediate neighbourhood* of S in U (we can think of it as the largest open of U where the graph of S makes sense). Note from lemma 2.19 that this U_u does not depend on the choice of controlling point for C/S, and therefore depends only on $S \to U$.

Lemma 2.21. *Let $S \to \mathcal{M}$ be any curve. There exists an étale cover $\bigsqcup_{i\in I} S_i \to S$ such that each $S_i \to \mathcal{M}$ is simple-controlled.*

Proof. Firstly, since $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ has normal crossings singularities, we can find an étale cover of $\mathcal{M}$ by simple charts. Moreover, any family of curves has an étale cover by controlled families. The result follows by combining these statements. □

Definition 2.22. Let $U \to \mathcal{M}$ be a simple chart, and let u be a point of U. Write $U_u \subseteq U$ for the largest open where the graph over u makes sense. Let Γ be the graph of u, and let V be a subset of the vertices of Γ. Let $E(V)$ be the set of edges of Γ which have exactly one endpoint in V. Let $Z(V)$ be closed subscheme of U_u cut out by the labels of edges in $E(V)$ — we write $\mathcal{J}_V$ for its ideal sheaf. For each vertex $v \in V$, let $\eta(v)$ denote the generic point of the irreducible component of the fibre $\mathcal{C}_u$ corresponding to v. For each edge $e \in E(V)$, let $\sigma_e \in C_{Z(V)}(Z(V))$ be the corresponding section. Let $\widetilde{C}_{Z(V)}$ be the blowup of $C_{Z(V)}$ along the union of these sections, and let $\bar{V}$ be the union of the connected components of $\widetilde{C}_{Z(V)}$ containing at least one $\eta(v)$. Then we have a closed immersion $\bar{V} \to C_{U_u}$, and we define $\mathcal{I}_V$ to be the ideal sheaf cutting it out.

Example 2.23. For example, with the universal deformation of the 2-pointed 2-gon discussed in section 1.2, the graph is a 2-gon with labels (u) and (v). If V consists of a single vertex then $\bar{V}$ will be the corresponding component of the special fibre. If V consists of both vertices then $\bar{V}$ is the whole of C, and if V is empty then so is $\bar{V}$.

Definition 2.24. Let Γ be a connected graph. A *relative component* of Γ is a pair (v, G) where v is a vertex of Γ and G is a connected component of $\Gamma \setminus v$. An edge from v to G is called a *separating edge* of the relative component.

Note that the set of relative components is empty if and only if Γ has exactly one vertex. Note that G determines v uniquely, but not vice-versa in general (though v does determine G if Γ is circuit-connected).

Definition 2.25 (The set of enriched structures)**.** Let $S \to \mathcal{M}$ be a simple-controlled curve with controlling point $\mathfrak{s}$ and $S \xrightarrow{s} U \to \mathcal{M}$ a simple neighbourhood. Write $u = s(\mathfrak{s})$, and let $\Gamma \coloneqq \Gamma_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be the graph of $\mathfrak{s}$ and U_u be the immediate neighborhood of S in U. An *enriched structure* on C/S with respect to U consists of, for each relative component (v, G) of Γ, an invertible quotient

$$q_{v,G} \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_{(v,G)},$$

such that S-locally there exists an isomorphism

$$\bigotimes_{\substack{v\in \mathrm{Vert}\,\Gamma \\ G\in\pi_0(\Gamma\setminus v)}} \mathscr{L}_{(v,G)} \cong \mathcal{O}_C.$$

We say two enriched structures $(q_{v,G}\colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_{(v,G)})_{v,G}$ and $(q'_{v,G}\colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}'_{(v,G)})_{v,G}$ (with respect to U) are *equivalent* if for every vertex v and every $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$ there exists an isomorphism $\psi_{v,G}\colon \mathscr{L}_{(v,G)} \to \mathscr{L}'_{(v,G)}$ making the obvious triangle commute.

Remark 2.26 (Changing the neighbourhood).

1. If $S \to U' \to \mathcal{M}$ is another simple neighbourhood of $S \to \mathcal{M}$, then $U \times_{\mathcal{M}} U'$ is also a simple neighbourhood.

2. Let $S \to U' \to U \to \mathcal{M}$ be a refinement of simple neighbourhoods. Let $\mathfrak{s} \in S$ be a controlling point, mapping to $u' \in U'$ and $u \in U$. Then by the universal property (lemma 2.18) the map $U'_{u'} \to U$ factors via U_u. Write Γ for the graph of $\mathfrak{s}$ (equivalently the graph of u or u') and let (v, G) be a relative component. Write $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ for the ideal sheaf over U_u and $\mathcal{I}'_{G^c}$ for that over $U'_{u'}$. Then it is clear that the pullback of $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ to the curve over $U'_{u'}$ is exactly $\mathcal{I}'_{G^c}$. As such, we see that enriched structures on C/S with respect to U are canonically the same as those taken with respect to U'.

3. Combining the above two points, we see that the definition of an enriched structure does not depend on the choice of simple neighbourhood U.

2.5 Pulling back enriched structures

In this section we will define the pullback of enriched structures. This will define the functor of enriched structures; it then makes sense to ask whether it is representable (indeed it is; see corollary 3.9). The definition is rather involved; we begin by introducing a condition '1-alignment' on curves. We show that any family of curves which is not 1-aligned does not admit any enriched structures. We then define the pullback when the target is 1-aligned, which suffices by the previous result.

Definition 2.27. Let C/S be a curve and $\bar{s} \to S$ a geometric point. We say C/S is *1-aligned at* $\bar{s}$ if for every circuit γ in the graph over $\bar{s}$, all the labels of edges in γ are equal. We say C/S is *1-aligned* if it is so at every geometric point of S.

Lemma 2.28. *Let C/S be a simple-controlled curve, and suppose the set of enriched structures on C/S is non-empty. Then C/S is 1-aligned.*

Proof. Let $\bar{s} \to S$ be a geometric point of S with Γ the graph of $C_{\bar{s}}/\bar{s}$. Write $R = \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{S,\bar{s}}}$. Suppose the set of enriched structures is non-empty. Given a vertex $v \in \Gamma$ and G a connected component of $\Gamma \setminus v$, we will show that all the edges from v to G have the same label. This is vacuously true if there are no such edges;

otherwise, write $p = p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_n$ for the singular points of $C_{\bar{s}}$ corresponding to these edges, and $(a) = (a_0), (a_1), \ldots, (a_n)$ for their labels. We will show that in fact every (a_i) is equal to (a). We identify the completed local ring $\widehat{\mathcal{O}_{C,p_i}}$ at the singular point p_i corresponding to the edge labelled (a_i) with $R[[x,y]]/(xy - a_i)$.

Write $s\colon S \to U_u \subseteq U$ for an immediate neighbourhood. Using that $\mathcal{M}$ has normal crossings singularities it is easy to write down a presentation of the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ restricted to the completed local ring in C_{U_u} at the image of p. Pulling back this presentation to C_R/R we find that the restriction of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ to $R[[x,y]]/(xy-a)$ is isomorphic to

$$\frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a)}\frac{\langle A, A_1, \cdots, A_n, X\rangle}{J}$$

where the submodule of relations J is generated by the 2×2 minors of the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & A_1 & \cdots & A_n & X \\ a & a_1 & \cdots & a_n & x \end{bmatrix} \tag{1}$$

together with the element $yX - A$. Thus our assumption that an enriched structure exists implies (after restriction) that there exists a surjective map of $R[[x,y]]/(xy-a)$-modules

$$\frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a)}\frac{\langle A, A_1, \cdots, A_n, X\rangle}{J} \twoheadrightarrow R[[x,y]]/(xy-a).$$

From this we will deduce that $a_i \in (a)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, and by symmetry this proves the lemma. First, identifying A, the A_i and X with their images in $\frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a)}$ we obtain elements A, A_i and X in $\frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a)}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. at least one of A, A_i, X is a unit (this uses that the target is local);
2. the minors of the matrix in (1) vanish;
3. $yX = A$.

Now (3) implies that A is not a unit, so at least one of $A_1, \cdots, A_n$, X is a unit.
Case 1: A_i a unit for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then $x \in (a_i)$ in $\frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a)}$. Thus there exists $g \in R[[x,y]]$ such that $x - ga_i \in (xy-a)$ in $R[[x,y]]$. So let $f \in R[[x,y]]$ be such that $x - ga_i = f \cdot (xy - a)$. Then $x - ga_i = fxy - fa$ in $R[[x,y]]$, so equating coefficients of x (and writing f_x for the coefficient of x in f, similarly for g) we find that $1 - g_x a_i = 0 - f_x a$. But then $1 = (a, a_i)$, which contradicts that fact that a and a_i must be contained in the maximal ideal of R.
Case 2: X a unit. Then for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have that $a_i \in (x)$ in $\frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a)}$, in other words a_i lies in the kernel of $R \to \frac{R[[x,y]]}{(xy-a,x)}$. But this kernel is exactly (a), so we deduce $a_i \in (a)$ as required. □

We will now define the pullback of enriched structures for a map of simple-controlled curves. Let $T \to \mathcal{M}$ and $S \to \mathcal{M}$ be simple-controlled curves with a map $f\colon T \to S$ over $\mathcal{M}$. By definition there exists a factorisation $S \xrightarrow{s} U \to \mathcal{M}$ with U a simple neighbourhood; clearly this U is also a simple neighbourhood of T. Without loss of generality (see remark 2.26) we can replace U with U_S, the immediate neighbourhood of S in U, and let $T \xrightarrow{t} U_T \subset U_S$ then be the immediate neighbourhood of T in U_S.

Write $\mathcal{E}(S)$ for the set of enriched structures on S with respect to U_S, and $\mathcal{E}(T)$ the same for T. We will construct a map $\mathcal{E}(S) \to \mathcal{E}(T)$ (we leave the verification that the construction of the map does not depend on the choice of U to the reader). Note that by lemma 2.28 it is enough to treat the case where C_S/S is 1-aligned—otherwise $\mathcal{E}(S)$ is empty and there is a unique map to $\mathcal{E}(T)$!

Before constructing the map we need some preliminary lemmas. Write Γ_S for the graph of S and Γ_T for the graph of T, so we get a specialisation map $\mathrm{sp}\colon \Gamma_S \to \Gamma_T$ which contracts exactly those edges whose labels become units on T (equivalently, on U_T). Let w be a vertex of Γ_T, and write $W = \mathrm{sp}^{-1}(w)$ for the set of vertices of Γ_S which map to w. So between any two vertices in W we can find a path all of whose edges have labels which become units on T.

Lemma 2.29. *The specialisation map induces a bijection $\pi_0(\Gamma_S \backslash W) \to \pi_0(\Gamma_T \backslash w)$.*

Proof. Given $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S \setminus W)$ and an element $g \in G$, we see that $\mathrm{sp}(g)$ is not equal to w and is thus contained in some $H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_T \setminus w)$. This H does not depend on the choice of $g \in G$, and so we define the map to send G to H. We leave the verification of the bijectivity to the reader. □

Lemma 2.30. *Assume that C_S/S is 1-aligned. Then for every $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S \setminus W)$ there exists a unique $v \in W$ such that $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S \setminus v)$.*

Proof. First we show that there is exists $v \in W$ such that every edge between G and W has one endpoint equal to v. Indeed, suppose that this is not the case, and let $e : v - g$ and $e' : v' - g'$ be two edges with $v, v' \in W$ distinct and $g, g' \in G$. Then we may combine e and e' with a path from v to v' consisting of edges that are contracted by sp, and with a path from g to g' within G, making a circuit. The 1-alignment then implies that every edge in this path has the same label, a label that becomes a unit on T, so the specialisation map contracts them all, a contradiction.

It is clear that G is then a connected component of $\Gamma_S \setminus v$. Furthermore, since Γ_S is connected there is at least one edge from G to v, and thus G is not a connected component of $\Gamma_S \setminus v'$ for any other $v' \in W$. □

Lemma 2.31. *Assume that C_S/S is 1-aligned. Given $H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_T \setminus w)$ there exists a unique vertex $v \in W$ and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S \setminus v)$ such that $\mathrm{sp}(G) = H$.*

Proof. Immediate from the previous two lemmas. □

Thus each relative component of Γ_T is the image of exactly one relative component of Γ_S.

Lemma 2.32. *Let $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S \setminus v)$ for some $v \in W$. Then exactly one of the following occurs:*

1. *$G \cap W$ is non-empty, i.e. $w \in \mathrm{sp}(G)$;*
2. *$\mathrm{sp}(G) \in \pi_0(\Gamma_T \setminus w)$.*

Proof. It is clear that (1) and (2) cannot both happen; we will show that if (1) does not hold then (2) does. Now suppose that G does not meet W; then $\mathrm{sp}(G) \subseteq \Gamma_T \setminus w$ and is connected. Let y be a vertex of Γ_T with a path to $\mathrm{sp}(G)$ that does not pass through w; we will show that $y \in \mathrm{sp}(G)$ and thus that $\mathrm{sp}(G)$ is a connected component of $\Gamma_T \setminus w$. By adding back in contracted edges where necessary, we may lift this path to a path in $\Gamma_S \setminus W \subseteq \Gamma_S \setminus v$ between a vertex x and G. But since G is a connected component of $\Gamma_S \setminus v$, this path must belong entirely to G. Hence $x \in G$ and $y = \mathrm{sp}(x) \in \mathrm{sp}(G)$ as desired. □

Thus for 1-aligned curves, we have a bijection

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi\colon \{&\text{Relative components } (v, G) \text{ of } \Gamma_S : \mathrm{sp}(v) \notin \mathrm{sp}(G)\} \\ &\to \{\text{Relative components } (w, H) \text{ of } \Gamma_T\} \\ &: (v, G) \mapsto \big(\mathrm{sp}(v), \mathrm{sp}(G)\big).\end{aligned}$$

Recall that we write $f\colon T \to S$.

Lemma 2.33. *Given $v \in W$ and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S \setminus v)$ with $G \cap W \neq \emptyset$, the coherent sheaf $f^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ on C_T is canonically isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_{C_T}$, and thus its only invertible quotient is itself.*

Proof. The closed subscheme of C_{U_S} corresponding to $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ lies over the closed subscheme of U_S cut out by labels on edges on edges between G and G^c (which are all contracted by sp, i.e. become units on U_T), so $U_T \to U_S$ does not meet this closed subscheme. Therefore the pullback of $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ to U_T is the unit ideal sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{C_{U_T}}$, the pullback to C_T of which is $\mathcal{O}_{C_T}$. □

We are now in a position to define the pullback of enriched structures $\mathcal{E}(S) \to \mathcal{E}(T)$ when $t\colon T \to S$ is a morphism of controlled curves and S has a simple neighborhood $s\colon S \to U$. Suppose we are given an enriched structure in $\mathcal{E}(S)$; this consists of a line bundle $\mathscr{L}_{(v,G)}$ for every relative component of Γ_S, together with a surjective map

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_{(v,G)},$$

and such that $\bigotimes_{v,G} \mathscr{L}_{(v,G)} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_S}$. We need to construct the similar data of an invertible quotient $f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}'_{(w,H)}$ for each relative component (w, H) of Γ_T.

By lemma 2.28, we know that C_S/S is 1-aligned, and therefore each such pair (w, H) corresponds to a pair $(v, G) = \Psi^{-1}(w, H)$ for some $v \in \mathrm{sp}^{-1}(w)$ and component $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma_S \setminus v)$ such that $G \cap \mathrm{sp}^{-1}(w) = \emptyset$, and we define $\mathscr{L}'_{(w,H)}$ by

$$\mathscr{L}'_{(w,H)} \coloneqq f^*\mathscr{L}_{(v,G)}.$$

Each of these is naturally an invertible quotient of $t^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c} = f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$. We want to define $(t^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}'_{(w,H)})_{(w,H)}$ to be the pullback, but we need to check that

$$\bigotimes_{w,H} \mathscr{L}'_{(w,H)} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_T}$$

locally on T. First the tensor product of all of these $\mathscr{L}'_{(w,H)}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\bigotimes_{w,H} \mathscr{L}'_{(w,H)} &= \bigotimes_{w,H} f^*\mathscr{L}_{\Psi^{-1}(w,H)} \\ &= \bigotimes_{\substack{v,G \\ \mathrm{sp}(v)\notin\mathrm{sp}(G)}} f^*\mathscr{L}_{(v,G)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now by lemma 2.33, the invertible quotient $f^*\mathscr{L}_{(v,G)}$ of $f^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is trivial if $\mathrm{sp}(v) \in \mathrm{sp(G)}$, so we may include them in the tensor product at no cost, so that locally on S we have:

$$\bigotimes_{w,H} \mathscr{L}'_{(w,H)} \cong \bigotimes_{v,G} f^*\mathscr{L}_{(v,G)} \cong f^*\mathcal{O}_{C_S} = \mathcal{O}_{C_T}.$$

2.6 Enriched structures for general C/S

We want to apply lemma A.4 to define enriched structures on arbitrary families of curves. In order to do this we need to check two things:

1. The full subcategory of simple-controlled curves is a base for the étale topology on schemes over $\mathcal{M}$;

2. The functor of enriched structures is a sheaf on the full subcategory of curves over S consisting of simple-controlled curves.

Condition (1) is immediate from lemma 2.21, so our task is to check (2). More precisely, we need to show that if C/S is a simple-controlled curve, $\{T_i\}_I \to S$ is an étale cover by simple-controlled curves, and for each $i, j \in I$ we have a cover

$\{T_{i,j,k}\}_{K_{i,j}}$ of $T_i \times_S T_j$ by simple-controlled curves, then the following diagram is an equaliser:

$$\mathcal{E}(S) \to \prod_i \mathcal{E}(T_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j,k} \mathcal{E}(T_{i,j,k}). \tag{2}$$

First consider the case where C/S is *not* 1-aligned. Then $\mathcal{E}(S)$ is empty by lemma 2.28. Moreover, there exists $i_0 \in I$ such that T_{i_0} hits a controlling point of S, and so (using that $T_{i_0} \to S$ is étale) we deduce that T_{i_0} is not 1-aligned, so $\mathcal{E}(T_{i_0})$ is empty. Similarly some $T_{i,j,k}$ hits a controlling point of S and thus admits no enriched structures. This we see all the three terms of eq. (2) are empty, so the diagram is certainly an equaliser! It thus remains to treat the case where S is 1-aligned.

The key tool for this is a slight generalisation of the definition of enriched structure given in definition 2.25 (which will also be very useful in section 3).

Definition 2.34. Let S' be a simple-controlled curve with graph Γ', and let $s' \colon S' \to U'$ be an immediate neighbourhood. Let $\Gamma' \to \Gamma$ be any contraction of Γ'. Define $S \hookrightarrow S'$ to be the locus in S' where the labels of the contracted edges are units, and similarly define $U \subseteq U'$ (using that Γ' is also the controlling graph of U'). Then $S \to U'$ factors via U; write $s \colon S \to U$.

Suppose we are given a vertex v of Γ and a connected component $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$. Write G' for the set of vertices of Γ' which map to G. Slightly abusing notation, define the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ on C_U/U to be the restriction to C_U of the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_{G'^c}$ on $C_{U'}/U'$.

Given any morphism $f \colon T \to S$ we define a Γ-*enriched structure* on T to be the data of, for each vertex v of Γ and connected component $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$, an invertible quotient

$$f^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_{(v,G)}$$

of sheaves on C_T, such that the tensor product of all the line bundles $\mathscr{L}_{(v,G)}$ is T-locally trivial on C_T, and such that each $\mathscr{L}_{(v,G)}$ has total degree zero on every fibre of C/T. The pullback is defined in the evident way (just pull back the invertible quotients — the combinatorial data is unchanged), yielding a presheaf

$$\mathcal{E}_\Gamma \colon \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}.$$

In this section we are mostly interested in the case where $\Gamma = \Gamma'$ (in which case it is clear that $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(S) = \mathcal{E}(S)$), but the more general case will be important in the next section. In general, we show that if S is 1-aligned then this equality also holds for any controlled T mapping to S:

Lemma 2.35. *In the setting of definition 2.34, suppose S is 1-aligned and T is controlled. Then $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(T) = \mathcal{E}(T)$.*

Proof. Write Γ_T for the graph of T, so we get a specialisation map $\mathrm{sp}\colon \Gamma \to \Gamma_T$. Since C/S is 1-aligned, this map sp has the property that, if H is a circuit-connected component of Γ, then sp contracts at least one edge in H if and only if it contracts every edge in H.

Moreover, if v is a vertex of Γ and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$ then either

1. Every edge from v to G is contracted by sp, in which case $t^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is canonically trivial on C_T, or
2. No edge from v to G is contracted by sp, in which case $H \coloneqq \mathrm{sp}(G)$ is a connected component of $\Gamma_T \setminus \mathrm{sp}(v)$, and $f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is canonically isomorphic to $t^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$, where $t\colon T \to U_T$ is the immediate neighbourhood of T in U (noting $U_T \subseteq U$). Furthermore, every relative component of Γ_T arises in this way.

Thus the data of a Γ-enriched structure on T is equivalent to the data of a Γ_T-enriched structure on T, but this is equivalent to the data of an ordinary enriched structure because Γ_T is the graph for T. The degree condition is satisfied for elements of $\mathcal{E}(T)$ by lemma 4.5 (this lemma is not proven until section section 4, but this is only for expository reasons — it is entirely independent of the present section). □

To prove that diagram (2) is an equaliser, we have already seen that we can reduce to the case where S is 1-aligned. In that situation, it is equivalent by lemma 2.35 to show that the diagram

$$\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(S) \to \prod_i \mathcal{E}_\Gamma(T_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j,k} \mathcal{E}_\Gamma(T_{i,j,k}). \tag{3}$$

is an equaliser, where we write Γ for the graph of S. We are done by the following lemma:

Lemma 2.36. *The functor $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$ from schemes over S to sets is representable; in particular it is a sheaf for every subcanonical topology.*

All we need right now is the sheaf property which is slightly quicker to prove, but we will need the representability very soon anyway.

Proof. This is immediate by combining three standard ingredients:

1. The representability of Quot schemes;
2. The inclusion of invertible sheaves into finitely presented quasi-coherent sheaves is relatively representable;
3. The unit section of the relative Picard scheme is relatively representable.

4. The subfunctor of the relative Picard space consisting of line bundles of total degree zero is representable.

Combining (1) and (2) we see that the functor of invertible quotients of each $\mathcal{I}_{G^e}$ is representable. We take the fibre product over S of these functors for each relative component (v, G) of Γ, and then (3) and (4) show that the additional conditions that the tensor product of all the $\mathscr{L}_{(v,G)}$ be trivial and that they all have degree 0 do not break representability. □

Therefore $\mathcal{E}$, as we have defined it, is an étale sheaf on the full subcategory of simple-controlled curves, and since every curve is étale-locally simple-controlled, the comparison lemma A.4 tells us that $\mathcal{E}$ extends uniquely (up to unique isomorphism) to an étale sheaf on all of $\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Definition 2.37. In the following, we will use $\mathcal{E}$ to refer to this unique extension, and for any curve $S \to \mathcal{M}$ we will call elements of $\mathcal{E}(S)$ *enriched structures on* C/S.

3 Representability of the functor of enriched structures

The aim of this section is to prove that $\mathcal{E}$ is relatively representable by an algebraic space over $\mathcal{M}$. Unsurprisingly, we will prove representability of $\mathcal{E}$ by reducing to lemma 2.36, the representability of $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$. Note that $\mathcal{E}$ is by definition a sheaf for the étale topology, as it was defined by extending a sheaf on the subcategory of controlled curves. Because of this, it is enough to show representability locally, so we may assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is a scheme and $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ is simple-controlled - write $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$ for its graph. Then $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}}$ is certainly representable, but does *not* in general coincide with $\mathcal{E}$. This will be remedied by glueing together various suitable $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma'}$, but before getting into the details we give an example where $\mathcal{E} \neq \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}}$.

3.1 Example

Let k be an algebraically closed field, and take three copies of $\mathbb{P}^1$ over k. Glue the point $(0 : 1)$ on each curve to the point $(1 : 0)$ on the next so as to form a triangle, and mark the points $(1 : 1)$ on each curve. In this way we obtain a stable curve of genus 1 with 3 marked points. Let $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ be its universal deformation as a stable marked curve, but then forget about the markings (they will no longer be relevant).

It is clear that $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ is simple-controlled with graph $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$ a triangle. Let (a), (b) and (c) be the labels on the edges, so $\mathcal{M} = \operatorname{Spec} k[[a, b, c]]$. We consider some examples:

1. Let p be a point of $\mathcal{M}$ where at least two of a, b and c are units (so C_p is irreducible). Then $\mathcal{E}(p)$ is the set containing the empty enriched structure, and $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}}(p)$ is a singleton consisting of the trivial enriched structure (since all the pullbacks of ideal sheaves are trivial). In particular, the two sets are naturally in bijection!

2. Let p be a point where exactly one of a, b and c is a unit; say a is a unit for simplicity of notation. Then Γ_p is obtained from Γ by contracting the edge labelled a. We find that $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}}(p)$ is empty but $\mathcal{E}(p)$ is non-empty, in fact it is isomorphic to k^*;

3. If p is a point where none of a, b or c is a unit (so p is the closed point) then $\mathcal{E}(p) = \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}}(p)$ directly from the definitions.

Summarising, in cases (1) and (3) the functor $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}}$ gives the 'correct' answer (i.e. the same as $\mathcal{E}$), but in case (2) it does not; instead it yields the empty set. We will fix this by glueing in $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma'}$ for various contractions $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma'$.

3.2 Glueing

Recall that we are assuming $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ to be simple-controlled, with graph $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$. Given a morphism of graphs $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma$ (given by contracting some edges), let $U_\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ be the open subscheme obtained by deleting the loci where the labels of contracted edges vanish. Hence for every $u \in U_\Gamma$ we have natural maps $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma \to \Gamma_u$. This U_Γ need not be controlled, but we can nonetheless imitate definition 2.34 and define a functor $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma \colon \mathbf{Sch}_{U_\Gamma}^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$.

We have schemes $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma'}$ as Γ' runs over various contractions of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$, from which we will build a representing object for $\mathcal{E}$. We will carefully specify certain loci along which to glue the various $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma'}$ in order to obtain a representing object for $\mathcal{E}$. First we need a few preliminaries.

Definition 3.1. Let $f \colon \Gamma \to \Gamma'$ be a morphism of graphs (given as always by contracting some edges). We say $f \colon \Gamma \to \Gamma'$ is *aligned* if for every circuit-connected component G of Γ, either

1. every vertex of G maps to the same vertex of Γ', or

2. the map f is injective on the vertices of G (equivalently, no edge in G is contracted).

Note that case (1) is *not* the same as saying that all edges in G are contracted — rather, it says there exists a connected spanning subgraph of G all of whose edges are contracted.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma$ be a contraction which is not aligned. Let $p \in U_\Gamma$. Then $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(p) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Since $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma$ is not aligned, there exists some circuit-connected component G of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that at least one non-loop edge of G is contracted, but the vertices of G do not all have the same image in Γ. Let e be such a contracted edge, let v be the vertex of Γ to which it is contracted, and let V be the set of vertices of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$ whose image in Γ is the vertex v.

Now not all the vertices of G are in V by assumption; let e' be an edge of G connecting such a vertex to V, and let γ be a circuit of G containing both e and e'. Thus γ has at least one edge e between two vertices in V and another edge e' between V and V^c.

We will prove the lemma by a careful analysis of the partial degrees which would appear in an enriched structure (more precisely, an element of $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(p)$) if one were to exist, and then deriving a numerical contradiction. First we have three claims.

Claim 3.2.1.

$$\#\textit{edges } V \textit{ to } V^c > \sum_{w \in V} \sum_{\substack{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \setminus w) \\ H \cap V = \emptyset}} \#\textit{edges } w \textit{ to } H \tag{4}$$

where the condition $H \cap V = \emptyset$ should be read as saying that H and V have no vertex in common.

The point of the claim is to get a strict inequality; a non-strict inequality here is essentially obvious.

Proof of claim: There is an obvious injective map from edges on the RHS of (4) to edges on the LHS: every edge between such w and H is in particular an edge between V and V^c. To show the strictness of the inequality we need to construct an edge from V to V^c which does not appear on the RHS. The key will be the circuit γ defined above.

Recall that e' is an edge of γ which has exactly one endpoint in V. Write w for the end of e' which is in V, and u for the other end of e'. If e' appears in the RHS of (4) then it must go from w to the connected component H of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \setminus w$ that contains u. But this H has a vertex w' in common with V, namely the next point where γ re-enters V (note that $w \neq w'$ since γ also contains e, an edge whose endpoints are both in V). Therefore e' is not on the RHS of (4), which means that the inequality is strict.



This concludes the proof of the first claim. Now let $(p^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_H)_H$ be an element of $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(p)$. We first compute the sums of partial degrees of $\mathscr{L}_H$ for H corresponding to vertices in V.

Claim 3.2.2.

$$\sum_{w\in V}\sum_{H\in\pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\setminus w)} \deg \mathscr{L}_H|_v = \sum_{w\in V}\sum_{\substack{H\in\pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\setminus w)\\ H\cap V=\emptyset}} \#\textit{edges } w \textit{ to } H.$$

where the condition $H \cap V = \emptyset$ should again be read as saying that H and V have no vertex in common.

Proof of claim: Fix $w \in V$ and $H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \setminus w)$. Note that if H and V have a vertex in common, then that vertex can be taken to be an endpoint of an edge to w that contracts to v. For if $w' \in H \cap V$, we can find a path from w' to w using only edges contracted to v, and thus H contains all the vertices of this path except for w itself. Now if an edge from H to w is contracted in Γ then $\mathscr{L}_H$ is trivial, so has degree 0.

On the other hand, if H and V are disjoint then by lemma 4.5 (this lemma is not proven until the next section, but this is only for expository reasons - it is entirely independent of the present section) we have that

$$\deg \mathscr{L}_H|_v = \#\text{ edges from } w \text{ to } H.$$

This concludes the proof of the claim. We now compute the sums of partial degree of $\mathscr{L}_H$ for H corresponding to vertices in V.

Claim 3.2.3.

$$\sum_{w\notin V}\sum_{H\in\pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\setminus w)} \deg \mathscr{L}_H|_v = -\#\textit{edges } V \textit{ to } V^c.$$

Proof of claim: Let $w \notin V$. Then for each $H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \setminus w)$, we have

$$\deg \mathscr{L}_H|_v = -\#\text{ edges from } w \text{ to } V \cap H.$$

Therefore, since every edge from w to V ends in exactly one connected component of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \setminus w$, we have

$$\sum_{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \setminus w)} \deg \mathscr{L}_H|_v = -\#\text{ edges from } w \text{ to } V.$$

Summing over all $w \in V^c$ concludes the proof of the claim.

We can now finish off the proof of the lemma by observing that (from the condition that the tensor product of all the line bundles appearing in an enriched structure must be trivial) we have

$$\sum_{w \in \operatorname{Vert} \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}} \sum_{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \setminus w)} \deg \mathscr{L}_H|_v = 0$$

which is incompatible with the above claims, thus yielding a contradiction to the assumption that $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(p)$ is non-empty. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f\colon \Gamma \to \Gamma'$ be a contraction between two contractions of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that f is aligned. Let $T \to U'_\Gamma$ be any morphism. Then there is a canonical identification*

$$\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(T) = \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma'}(T).$$

Proof. Let v be a vertex of Γ' and write V for the set of vertices of Γ mapping to v. Since f is aligned it induces a bijection

$$\varphi\colon \bigsqcup_{w \in V} \{H \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus w) : H \cap V = \emptyset\} \to \pi_0(\Gamma' \setminus v).$$

Then for each $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma' \setminus v)$ we note that $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_T = \mathcal{I}_{\varphi^{-1}(G)^c}|_T$ and define $\mathscr{L}_G = \mathscr{L}_{\varphi^{-1}(G)}$ with the obvious map from $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_T$. To check that we have an enriched structure with respect to Γ' it suffices to verify that the tensor product of all these bundles is trivial. But this is immediate from the same property of the original enriched structure with respect to Γ, using that $\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_T$ is canonically trivial whenever an edge between H and H^c is contracted by f. □

Definition 3.4. Let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma_2$ be two contractions. Write $U_i \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ for the largest open subschemes on which Γ_i makes sense — more precisely, let U_i be empty if the graph Γ_i does not arise for any point in $\mathcal{M}$, and otherwise pick such a point in $\mathcal{M}$ and apply the definition from section 2.3, observing that the resulting U_i is independent of the choice of point. Define the open subscheme $U_{1,2} \subseteq U_1 \times_{\mathcal{M}} U_2$ by

$$U_{1,2} = \left\{ p \in U_1 \times_{\mathcal{M}} U_2 : \exists \text{ a diagram } \begin{array}{ccc} & \Gamma_1 & \\ \nearrow & & \searrow \\ \tilde{\Gamma} & \longrightarrow & \Gamma_p \\ \searrow & & \nearrow \\ & \Gamma_2 & \end{array} \text{ such that } \begin{array}{ccc} & \Gamma_1 & \\ \nearrow & & \searrow \\ \tilde{\Gamma} & & \\ \searrow & & \nearrow \\ & \Gamma_2 & \end{array} \text{ are both aligned} \right\}.$$

It is clear that $U_{1,2}$ is constructible in $\mathcal{M}$, and it is closed under generalisation essentially by construction, hence $U_{1,2}$ is open in $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 3.5. *We carry over the notation from definition 3.4. Suppose $T \to U_1 \cap U_2$ does not factor via $U_{1,2}$. Then at least one of $\mathcal{E}_1(T)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2(T)$ is empty.*

Proof. Since enriched structures admit pullbacks it is enough to treat the case where T is a point. The result is then clear from lemma 3.2. □

Lemma 3.6. *We carry over the notation from definition 3.4. Let $T \to U_{1,2}$ be any morphism. Then the maps in lemma 3.3 induce canonical isomorphisms*

$$\mathcal{E}_1(T) = \mathcal{E}(T) = \mathcal{E}_2(T).$$

Proof. Immediate from lemma 3.3. □

Definition 3.7. We define a scheme $\mathcal{E}_{glue}/\mathcal{M}$ by glueing all the $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}$ as Γ_i runs over contractions of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$, where we glue $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}$ to $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_j}$ over $U_{i,j}$ along the isomorphisms given in lemma 3.6.

Theorem 3.8. *The isomorphisms given in lemma 3.6 induce an isomorphism of functors from $\mathcal{E}$ to $\mathcal{E}_{glue}$.*

Proof. It is enough to verify that the functors coincide on simple-controlled curves. Let $T \to \mathcal{M}$ be such a morphism, with graph Γ_T. We have a contraction $f\colon \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma_T$. If $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma$ is any other contraction, then $T \to \mathcal{M}$ factors via U_Γ if and only if f factors via $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma$ (and if not then $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(T)$ is clearly empty). It thus suffices to consider intermediate contractions $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \to \Gamma \to \Gamma_T$. Moreover, if $\Gamma \to \Gamma_T$ is not aligned then $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(T)$ is empty, so again it can be ignored.

Given two aligned intermediate contractions Γ, $\Gamma' \to \Gamma$, it is immediate that $T \to \mathcal{M}$ factors via $U_{\Gamma,\Gamma'}$, and so $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma(T) = \mathcal{E}(T) = \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma'}(T)$ are identified by the glueing as required. □

Corollary 3.9. *The functor $\mathcal{E}$ of enriched structures is representable.*

4 Enriched structures over separably closed fields

Maino defined enriched structures on curves over fields in a way which looks rather different from what we write. We will show that our definition is in fact equivalent in this case. We begin by recalling her definition, which we call a *Maino-enriched* structure to distinguish the terminology from what we use.

Definition 4.1. Let k be a separably closed field, and C/k be a curve. Write $C_1, \cdots, C_r$ for the irreducible components of C. For $1 \leq i \leq r$ write C_i^c for the union of the $C_j : j \neq i$. A *Maino-enriched structure* on C is an r-tuple $\mathscr{F}_1, \cdots, \mathscr{F}_r$ of line bundles on C such that

$$\bigotimes_{1 \leq i \leq r} \mathscr{F}_i \cong \mathscr{O}_C \tag{5}$$

and for every $1 \leq i \leq r$, we have

$$\mathscr{F}_i|_{C_i} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_i}(-C_i \cap C_i^c) \tag{6}$$

and

$$\mathscr{F}_i|_{C_i^c} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_i^c}(C_i \cap C_i^c). \tag{7}$$

Note that the symbol $\cong$ means 'is isomorphic to' — we do not specify the isomorphisms.

Before showing equivalence to our rather more involved definition, we give a slightly modified (but equivalent) version of the above definition, since it will make the comparison rather more direct:

Definition 4.2. Let k be a separably closed field, and C/k be a curve. Write Γ for the graph of C/k. An *M-enriched structure* on C/k consists of, for each relative component (v, G) of Γ a line bundle $\mathscr{F}_G$ on C such that

$$\bigotimes_{v, G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)} \mathscr{F}_G \cong \mathscr{O}_C \tag{8}$$

and for every (v, G) we have

$$\mathscr{F}_G|_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-C_G \cap C_{G^c}) \tag{9}$$

(where C_G denotes the union of the components of C corresponding to vertices in G) and

$$\mathscr{F}_G|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(C_G \cap C_{G^c}). \tag{10}$$

Given an M-enriched structure $(\mathscr{F}_G)_G$ it is easy to see that we can obtain a Maino-enriched structure by defining $\mathscr{F}_v = \otimes_{G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)} \mathscr{F}_G^\vee$ (use that conditions (5) and (7) together imply (6)).

Lemma 4.3. *The above construction induces a bijection between Maino-enriched structures and M-enriched structures.*

Proof. If V is a set of vertices of Γ then we are writing C_V for the union of the corresponding components of C. If (v, G) is a relative component then C_{G^c} is a closed subscheme of C, and we can also define $C \setminus C_G$ to be the open subscheme of C obtained by deleting C_G. Then C_{G^c} is the closure of $C \setminus C_G$.

With the notation out of the way, we can build an M-enriched structure from a Maino-enriched structure $(\mathscr{F}_v)$ as follows. Given a vertex v and component $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$, write

$$X \coloneqq C \setminus \cup_{\substack{G' \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v) \\ G' \neq G}} C_{G'}.$$

Let

$$g \colon \mathscr{F}_v|_{C_v} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_v}(-C_v \cap C_{v^c})$$

be an isomorphism. Then on $X \setminus C_G$, the isomorphism g restricts to a trivialisation of $\mathscr{F}_v$. Then we define a line bundle $\mathscr{F}_G$ by taking the restriction of the line bundle $\mathscr{F}_v^\vee$ to X, and the trivial bundle on $C \setminus C_G$, and glueing them on $X \setminus C_G$ along the trivialisation g.

We leave it to the reader to check that this is well-defined and an inverse to the construction above. □

For the remainder of this section, take a simple controlled curve C/S where $S = \operatorname{Spec} k$, with immediate neighourhood $s \colon S \to U$. We will exhibit an isomorphism between the enriched structures on C/S and the M-enriched structures on C/S. In particular, this shows that (when the test object is a separably closed point) the data of the surjections from the ideal sheaves is redundant, and the line bundles themselves actually determine the enriched structure. We do not know if this is the case in general. Write Γ for the graph of C/S.

4.1 The structure of pullbacks of certain ideal sheaves to fibres

Lemma 4.4. *Let (v, G) be a relative component of Γ. Write B_G for the union of the sections corresponding to separating edges of (v, G), which we think of as a set of smooth points on C_G or C_{G^c}, or as a divisor (on either) where each point has multiplicity 1.*

Let T_G be the torsion module on C_G given by

$$T_G = \bigoplus_{p \in B_G} k_p^{\oplus (B_G - p)}$$

where k_p denotes the skyscraper sheaf k at p. Then there exist isomorphisms

$$f_G \colon s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G, \tag{11}$$

$$f_{G^c}\colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{p\in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \tag{12}$$

and for each $b \in B_G$ an isomorphism

$$g_b\colon b^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G)\oplus T_G\right) \to b^*\left(\bigoplus_{p\in B_G}\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p)\right)$$

such that for each $b \in B_G$ the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} b^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G)\oplus T_G\right) & \xrightarrow{\qquad g_b \qquad} & b^*\left(\bigoplus_{p\in B_G}\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p)\right) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle b^*f_G} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle b^*f_{G^c}} \\ b^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G} & = (s\circ b)^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} = & b^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}. \end{array}$$

Moreover, if we view the isomorphism g_b as being a morphism

$$b^*\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-b)\oplus\bigoplus_{B_G-b} k \xrightarrow{\sim} b^*\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)\oplus\bigoplus_{B_G-b} k,$$

then g_b is the identity on the $\bigoplus_{B_G-b} k$ parts, and induces an isomorphism $b^*\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-b) \xrightarrow{\sim} b^*\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)$ (in particular g_b respects the evident direct sum decomposition).

Proof. We may assume the immediate neighbourhood U is affine; write $R := \mathcal{O}_U(U)$. In the notation of definition 2.22, let $\mathcal{J} = (e_p : p \in B_G)$ be the ideal of R generated by the labels of singular points in B_G. Write $\pi_u\colon C_U \to U$ and $\pi_s\colon C \to S$ for the structure maps, $\iota_{G^c}\colon C_{G^c} \to C$ and $\iota_G\colon C_G \to C$ for the inclusions (closed immersions).

First we analyse $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}$ outside points in B_G. On the open subscheme $C_U \setminus C_G$ we find that $\pi_u^*\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$, so we find that outside B_G we have $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} = \iota_{G^c}^*\pi_u^*\mathcal{J}$. Hence away from B_B we find that $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}$ is just the pullback along π_s of $s^*\mathcal{J}$, and the latter is a free k-module generated by symbols e_p as p runs over B_G.

Next we analyse $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G}$ outside points in B_G. On the open subscheme $C\setminus C_{G^c}$ we find that $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is the trivial bundle, so it follows that $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G}$ is canonically trivial outside points in B_G.

It remains to analyse in detail what happens locally at a point in B_G. By fpcq descent we may work with completed local rings at such a point, taking care that the morphisms we construct glue suitably. We fix now some $b \in B_G$, and for the remainder of this proof the letter p will be an index running over $B_G - b$. After choosing an isomorphism we may write

$$A = \frac{\widehat{R_s}[[x,y]]}{(xy - e_b)}$$

for the completed local ring of C_U at b. If $\mathfrak{m}$ is the maximal ideal of $\widehat{R_s}$ then locally

$$C_{G^c} = \operatorname{Spec} \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m} + (x)} = k[[y]] \quad \text{and} \quad C_G = \operatorname{Spec} \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m} + (y)} = k[[x]].$$

Next we will compute the sheaves $\iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G}$, $b^* \iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = b^* \iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ and $\iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}$ explicitly as A-modules (here we will slightly abuse notation by conflating A-modules and quasi coherent sheaves on $\operatorname{Spec} A$). First we have

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = (\mathcal{J}, x) \otimes_A \frac{A}{(\mathfrak{m}, y)} &\xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\bigoplus_p k \right) \oplus xk[[x]] \\ e_b = 0 &\mapsto 0 \\ x &\mapsto (0, x) \\ e_p &\mapsto (\delta_p, 0) \end{aligned}$$

where δ_p indicates the element of $\bigoplus_p k$ taking value 1 in the p-th position and zero elsewhere. Next we find

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = (\mathcal{J}, x) \otimes_A \frac{A}{(\mathfrak{m}, x)} &\xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\bigoplus_p k[[y]] \right) \oplus k[[y]] \\ e_b &\mapsto (0, y) \\ x &\mapsto (0, 1) \\ e_p &\mapsto (\delta_p, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where δ_p is as above but taking values in $\bigoplus_p k[[y]]$. Finally we compute

$$\begin{aligned} b^* \iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = b^* \iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = (\mathcal{J}, x) \otimes_A \frac{A}{(\mathfrak{m}, x, y)} &\xrightarrow{\sim} \left(\bigoplus_p k \right) \oplus k \\ e_b = 0 &\mapsto 0 \\ x &\mapsto (0, 1) \\ e_b &\mapsto (\delta_p, 0). \end{aligned}$$

The module $b^* \iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = b^* \iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is naturally a quotient of $\iota_G^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ and of $\iota_{G^c}^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c}$, and the maps are given by

$$\begin{aligned} xk[[x] \to k \leftarrow k[[y]] \\ x \mapsto 1 \leftarrow\!\shortmid\ 1 \\ x^2 \mapsto 0 \leftarrow\!\shortmid\ y. \end{aligned}$$

We leave it to the reader to check that with the natural glueing maps the local descriptions we have given here combine to yield the lemma. □

Lemma 4.5. *We continue in the notation of the previous lemma. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be an invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$.*

1. *There exists an isomorphism $\mathscr{L}|_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G)$.*
2. *There exists an isomorphism $\mathscr{L}|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G + D)$ where D is some effective divisor on C_{G^c};*
3. *If moreover we assume $\mathscr{L}$ to have total degree 0, then the divisor D above is zero.*

Proof. Part (3) follows from parts (1) and (2) by a degree calculation. Part (1) is clear since we know $s^*\mathcal{I}_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G$ and T_G is torsion so is killed by any map to an invertible sheaf. The content is in (2).

To give a map $\bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \to \mathscr{L}|_{C_{G^c}}$ is to give a section of $\mathscr{L}(-b)|_{C_{G^c}}$ for each $b \in B_G$. The glueing conditions at the singular points imply that each such section lands in $\mathscr{L}(-B_G)|_{C_{G^c}}$ and takes a non-zero value at b. Hence $\mathscr{L}(-B_G)|_{C_{G^c}}$ admits a non-zero global section, and the result is clear (noting that C_{G^c} is connected). □

4.2 Comparing the two notions of enriched structure

Lemma 4.6. *Let*

$$(\varphi_G \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_G)_G$$

be an enriched structure on C. Then $(\mathscr{L}_G)_G$ is an M-enriched structure on C.

Proof. From the definition of an enriched structure we have that $\bigotimes_G \mathscr{L}_G$ is trivial, so formula (8) is satisfied. We must verify that formulae (9) and (10) hold, which is done by lemma 4.5. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let v be a vertex of Γ, and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a line bundle on C such that*

$$\mathscr{L}|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(G \cap G^c)$$

and

$$\mathscr{L}|_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-G \cap G^c).$$

Let $\varphi \colon s^* I_{G^c}|_{C_G} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}|_{C_G}$ be any surjection. Then there exists a unique surjection $\Phi \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}$ such that $\Phi|_{C_G} = \varphi$.

Proof. We adopt the notation of lemma 4.4 (so $B_G = G \cap G^c$), and choose a compatible system of isomorphisms as in the lemma. By [Fer03] and lemma 4.4, it is equivalent to show that there is a unique surjection

$$\bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \to \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G)$$

such that suitable compatibilities hold at each of the point $p \in B_G$. Fix one $b \in B_G$. To give a map $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \to \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G)$ is the same as to give a global section of $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G - b)$. Since the sheaf T is torsion we know that it is killed by $\varphi \circ f_G^{-1}$, which implies that the section of $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G - b)$ must vanish at every point in the support of $B_G - p$. Since C_{G^c} is connected, this further implies that the section is actually constant. To pin the section down completely it is enough to determine its value at a single point. Indeed, its value at b is determined by the restriction of the isomorphism g_b to the first factor, and we are done. □

Lemma 4.8. *Let $(\mathscr{L}_G)_G$ be an M-enriched structure on C. Then there exists an enriched structure $(\varphi_G \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_G)_G$. Moreover, if $(\varphi'_G \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_G)_G$ is another enriched structure with the same quotients, then it is equivalent to $(\varphi_G \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_G)_G$.*

Proof. To construct the enriched structure, we first choose surjections $s^* I_{G^c}|_{C_G} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_G|_{C_G}$, which is certainly possible since the $s^* I_{G^c}|_{C_G}$ is isomorphic to the direct sum of $\mathscr{L}_G|_{C_G}$ with a torsion module (lemma 4.4). Lemma 4.7 then allows us to extend these surjections to an enriched structure. For the uniqueness, notice that any two enriched structure structures $(\varphi_G \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_G)_G$ differ by multiplications by elements of k^* since (up to torsion) they are just isomorphisms of line bundles on *connected* curves over a separably closed field. The uniqueness part of lemma 4.7 then shows that the two enriched structure structures are equivalent. □

Combining lemma 4.6 and lemma 4.8 we immediately deduce

Theorem 4.9. *The map from enriched structures to M-enriched structures which sends $(\varphi_G \colon s^* I_G \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_G)_G$ to $(\mathscr{L}_G)_G$ induces a bijection between equivalence classes of enriched structures and M-enriched structures.*

5 The stack of enriched structures and universal Néron models

Suppose that S is a scheme, $U \subseteq S$ a dense open subscheme, and $A \to U$ an abelian scheme. A *Néron model* of A over S is a proper smooth group algebraic space N/S together with an isomorphism $N_U \to A$, satisfying the *Néron mapping property*: for every smooth morphism $T \to S$, and for every U-morphism $f \colon T_U \to N_A$, there exists a unique S-morphism $F \colon T \to N$ such that $F|_{T_U} = f$. In [Hol16a] the second author investigated Néron models in the case of jacobians of nodal curves, giving necessary and sufficient criteria for their existence.

For the remainder of this section we work over a fixed base scheme Λ, which we assume to be excellent and regular — for example, we could take $\Lambda = \operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{C}$ or

$\Lambda = \operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{Z}$. We assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is smooth over Λ and the boundary is a relative normal crossings divisor (cf. [DM69]). We write $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}$ for the locus of smooth curves in $\mathcal{M}$, and $J/\mathring{\mathcal{M}}$ for the jacobian of the universal smooth curve.

In [Hol14] the second author constructed a *universal Néron-model-admitting morphism* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$, a terminal object in the category of *Néron model admitting morphisms*. A Néron model admitting morphism is a morphism $t\colon T \to \mathcal{M}$ such that

- T is regular;
- $t^{-1}\mathring{\mathcal{M}}$ is dense in T;
- t^*J admits a Néron model over T.

In particular, J admits a Néron model $N/\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$. In other words, the universal property says that any Néron model admitting morphism factors uniquely via $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M}$.

This $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ is not quasi-compact over $\mathcal{M}$, but it can be written as a union of a 'tower' of quasi-compact pieces. The general construction is more involved, but the first step of the tower is easy to describe; we define $\mathcal{M}^1 \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ to be the largest open substack such that the pullback of $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathcal{M}^1$ is regular (equivalently, $\mathcal{M}^1 \to \mathcal{M}$ is a terminal object in the category of 1-aligned morphisms to $\mathcal{M}$). The aim of this section is to construct an isomorphism between $\mathcal{M}^1$ and $\mathcal{E}$.

First we will define a map $\mathbb{E}\colon \mathcal{M}^1 \to \mathcal{E}$. In fact we will do something equivalent but a bit slicker; we will construct an enriched structure on the tautological curve over every simple-controlled non-degenerate 1-aligned morphism $t\colon T \to \mathcal{M}$.

Definition 5.1. Let $t\colon T \to \mathcal{M}$ be a non-degenerate morphism from a scheme to $\mathcal{M}$ which is 1-aligned. Assume T is simple-controlled with graph Γ. Let v be a vertex of Γ and $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$. Let $T \to U \to \mathcal{M}$ be an immediate neighbourhood, and let $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ be the ideal sheaf on C_U as in definition 2.22. The same recipe defines an ideal sheaf $\mathcal{L}_{G^c}$ on C_T, and we have a canonical surjection $t^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{G^c}$. Moreover, alignment of $T \to \mathcal{M}$ means that all the edges between v and G have the same label (which is non-zero by regularity), and so $\mathcal{L}_{G^c}$ cuts out a locally-principal closed subscheme, which has codimension 1 since $t^*\mathring{\mathcal{M}}$ is dense, and hence this closed subscheme is a Cartier divisor on C_T. Hence $\mathcal{L}_{G^c}$ is actually a line bundle. The map $t^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{G^c}$ from above is then the quotient map required in the definition of an enriched structure. One easily checks that the conditions are satisfied.

Remark 5.2. This enriched structure can alternatively be defined by looking at the closure of the unit section in the relative Picard space of C/T, and imposing degree conditions to cut out the right sections. Note that the closure of the unit section is (étale locally on T) a union of sections by our alignment assumption, see [Hol16a].

The remainder of this section will be taken up with proving that $\mathbb{E}\colon \mathcal{M}^1 \to \mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism, and observing a few consequences. First a quick lemma, then we do quite some work to prove that, if Λ is a point, then $\mathcal{E}_\Lambda$ is regular. From this it is a small step to show that $\mathbb{E}$ is an isomorphism.

Lemma 5.3. *The map $\mathbb{E}\colon \mathcal{M}^1 \to \mathcal{E}$ is surjective.*

Proof. Let k be a separably closed field, C_0/k a curve and E an enriched structure on C_0. We wish to show the existence of a regular curve $C/k[[t]]$ with C_0 isomorphic to the special fibre, and such that E is the enriched structure induced by C as in definition 5.1. If $\mathcal{M} = \bar{\mathcal{M}}_{g,n}$ for some g, n this is proven in [EM02, Corollary 6.6], or [Mai98] (who assumes characteristic zero). The general case follows from a similar tangent space computation, which we omit. This C is a regular curve over a dedekind scheme and thus 1-aligned, so the tautological map $\operatorname{Spec} k[[t]] \to \mathcal{M}$ lifts canonically to $\mathcal{M}^1$. It is then immediate from the construction of $\mathbb{E}$ that the image of the closed point of $\operatorname{Spec} k[[t]]$ maps to the point corresponding to E. □

5.1 Geometric regularity of the stack of enriched structures

In this section we assume that $\Lambda = \operatorname{Spec} k$ for some separably closed field k. Note that $\mathcal{M}$ is locally of finite type over k (by our 'relative normal crossings' assumptions), and hence so are $\mathcal{M}^1$ and $\mathcal{E}$. We will show that $\mathcal{E}$ is regular by computing the dimension of its tangent space. Since regularity is étale local we may and will assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is an integral scheme. By [Hol14] it follows that $\mathcal{M}^1$ is integral, hence by lemma 5.3 that $\mathcal{E}$ is irreducible.

Write d for the dimension of $\mathcal{M}$. By our finite-type assumption it is enough to check that $\mathcal{E}$ is regular at all k points. We fix p a k-point of $\mathcal{E}$.

Lemma 5.4. $\dim_p \mathcal{E} \geq d$

We will see later that this is an equality.

Proof. Since our schemes are of finite type over a field, this follows from the irreducibility of $\mathcal{E}$ and the dominance of $\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}$ (which follows from the same property for $\mathcal{M}^1 \to \mathcal{M}$). □

Write $\pi\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}$ for the structure map. Write $\pi_*\colon T_p\mathcal{E} \to T_{\pi(p)}\mathcal{M}$ for the map on tangent spaces induced by π.

Lemma 5.5. *Write Γ for the graph of the curve over p. Then*

$$\dim \operatorname{Ker} \pi_* \leq \#\{\textit{non-loop edges of } \Gamma\} + \#\operatorname{Vert}\Gamma - \sum_{v \in \operatorname{Vert}\Gamma} \#\pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v) - 1.$$

We will see later that this is an equality.

Proof. In this proof we write $k[\epsilon] \coloneqq k[\epsilon]/\epsilon^2$. We think of the tangent space to $\mathcal{E}$ at p as the space of pointed maps from $T \coloneqq \operatorname{Spec} k[\epsilon]$ to $\mathcal{E}$ through p. The kernel of π_* corresponds exactly to those maps which factor via the inclusion of the fibre over $\pi(p)$; in other words, where the curve does not deform, only the enriched structure on it deforms.

Let C_0/k be the curve corresponding to p, and let $C = C_0 \times_k k[\epsilon]$, a constant deformation. Let E be the enriched structure on C_0 corresponding to p. We need to show that the dimension of the space of enriched structures on C which restrict to E on C_0 is at most

$$N \coloneqq \#\{\text{non-loop edges of } \Gamma\} + \#\operatorname{Vert}\Gamma - \sum_{v \in \operatorname{Vert}\Gamma} \#\pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v) - 1.$$

Let (v, G) be a relative component of Γ. Write $t\colon T \to \mathcal{M}$ for the tautological morphism. Write B_G for the set of sections in $C(T)$ corresponding to the edges between G and G^c. We find by lemma 4.4 (and using that t factors via a point) that

$$t^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_G} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus \text{torsion}$$

and so has a unique invertible quotient $\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G)$ up to isomorphism. By the condition that the tensor product of all the line bundles be trivial we find (lemma 4.5) that if $\mathscr{L}_G$ is part of an enriched structure on C then $\mathscr{L}_G|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(B_G)$. Applying lemma 4.4 again we obtain

$$t^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b),$$

so as in lemma 4.5, surjective maps to $\mathscr{L}_G$ correspond to elements of

$$\bigoplus_{b \in B_G} H^0(C_{G^c}, \mathcal{O}(B_G - b))$$

and the glueing conditions imply that the section under consideration lands in

$$H^0(C_{G^c}, \mathcal{O}) \subseteq H^0(C_{G^c}, \mathcal{O}(B_G - b)).$$

Since $C_{G^c} \to T$ is proper, flat and has reduced connected geometric fibres we deduce that $H^0(C_{G^c}, \mathcal{O}) = k[\epsilon]$. To specify the surjection to $\mathscr{L}_G$ is to specify the elements of $k[\epsilon]$ at points in B_G which glue these maps together. The surjections are already specified over the closed point k (since we are looking at the tangent space to a fixed enriched structure), so we get a k-worth of choices at each element of B_G. We do not claim (at this point) that all of these enriched structures actually

exist, we only say that any enriched structure must satisfy these conditions (hence the inequality in the statement of the lemma).

At this point we can simply count the dimension, imitating the proof of [Mai98, proposition 2.12]. Let $v_1, \dots, v_r$ be the vertices of Γ, and define

$$n_i = \#\{\text{edges } v - v^c\} - \#\pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v_i).$$

The dimension of the space of choices for $\mathscr{L}_G$ (for $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v_1)$) is the number of edges from v_1 to G, minus 1 to allow for adjusting the isomorphism on G. Summing over $G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v_1)$ we find that the dimension of the space of choices for the $\mathscr{L}_G : G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v_1)$ is n_1.

A similar argument for v_2 yields that the dimension of the space of choices for the $\mathscr{L}_G : G \in \pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v_2)$ is n_2, except that $\#\{\text{edges } v_1 - v_2\} - 1$ choices were already determined by our choices for v_1 and the condition that the tensor product of all the bundles together be trivial. Thus the dimension of the space of choices for connected components in the complements of v_1 *or* v_2 is $n_1 + n_2 - \#\{\text{edges } v_1 - v_2\} + 1$. Continuing in this fashion yields that the total dimension is N as required. □

Lemma 5.6. *Write* $\operatorname{Part}\Gamma$ *for the decomposition of* Γ *into circuit-connected components as in lemma 2.4. Then*

$$\dim \operatorname{coker} \pi_* \geq \sum_{G \in \operatorname{Part}\Gamma} (\#\operatorname{edges} G - 1)$$

We will see later that this is an equality.

Proof. This follows easily from the fact that enriched structures can only exist when the curve is 1-aligned (lemma 2.28). If $G \in \operatorname{Part}\Gamma$ then let T_G be the $(\#\operatorname{edges} G)$-dimensional subspace of $T_{\pi(p)}\mathcal{M}$ spanned by deforming those nodes which are edges in G. Then the intersection of $\pi_* T_P \mathcal{E}$ with T_G cannot meet any of the coordinate hyperplanes except at the origin, from which we deduce that the image is contained in[2] a 1-dimensional subspace of T_G. Applying this condition for each G, the lemma follows. □

Lemma 5.7.

$$\sum_{G \in \operatorname{Part}\Gamma} (\#\operatorname{edges} G - 1) = \#\{\textit{non-loop edges of } \Gamma\} + \#\operatorname{Vert}\Gamma - \sum_{v \in \operatorname{Vert}\Gamma} \#\pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v) - 1.$$

[2]Later we will deduce that this containment is an equality. It should be possible to give an intrinsic characterisation of this 1-dimensional subspace but we have not yet done so.

Proof. We may assume Γ has no loops since they make no contribution to either side. Further, elements of $\operatorname{Part}\Gamma$ which are bridges make no contribution to either side, and both sides of the equality are additive in disjoint unions of graphs, so we may assume Γ is circuit-connected (so $\#\operatorname{Part}\Gamma = 1$). Then we compute both sides; the LHS is just the number of edges in Γ minus 1. The circuit-connectivity implies that each $\pi_0(\Gamma \setminus v)$ has exactly 1 element, and the result follows. □

Proposition 5.8. *$\mathcal{E}$ is regular at p.*

Proof. From the definition of the kernel and cokernel we have that

$$\dim T_p\mathcal{E} - \dim T_{\pi(p)}\mathcal{M} = \dim\ker\pi_* - \dim\operatorname{coker}\pi_*.$$

Combining with lemmas 5.5 and 5.6 we deduce that

$$\dim T_p\mathcal{E} \leq \dim T_{\pi(p)}\mathcal{M} = d.$$

But by lemma 5.4 we know that $\dim_p \mathcal{E} \geq d$, so in fact all these inequalities are equalities and $\mathcal{E}$ is regular at p. □

5.2 $\mathbb{E}$ is an isomorphism

Returning now to the case where Λ is a regular excellent scheme, we prove that $\mathbb{E}$ is an isomorphism. This mostly consists of mild gymnastics with properties of morphisms — the main work was carried out in section 5.1. In fact, it would have been enough to show that $\mathcal{E}_k$ was reduced, as regularity would follow from what we prove in this section, but in any case it was nice to play with computing tangent spaces, since this is something which our definition of enriched structure over arbitrary base schemes has made possible. Anyway, on with the main result:

Theorem 5.9. *$\mathbb{E}\colon \mathcal{M}^1 \to \mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Being an isomorphism is local on $\mathcal{M}$, so we may assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a scheme. Note that $\mathcal{M}^1$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are both of finite presentation over $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\operatorname{Spec} k \to \Lambda$ be any geometric point (so k is some algebraically closed field). Now $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_k$ is dense in $\mathcal{M}^1_k$, so it is dense in $\mathcal{E}_k$ by surjectivity of $\mathbb{E}_k$. Moreover, $\mathcal{E}_k$ is regular by section 5.1, in particular it is reduced. The map $\mathcal{E}_k \to \mathcal{M}_k$ is 1-aligned by lemma 2.28. By the universal property of $\mathcal{M}^1_k$ (see [Hol14, definitions 3.1 and 12.1] — note that the normal-crossings assumption is superfluous) we obtain a map $\mathbb{F}_k\colon \mathcal{E}_k \to \mathcal{M}^1_k$ (over $\mathcal{M}_k$):

$$\mathcal{M}^1_k \xrightarrow{\mathbb{E}_k} \mathcal{E}_k \xrightarrow{\mathbb{F}_k} \mathcal{M}^1_k.$$

The composite $\mathbb{F}_k \circ \mathbb{E}_k$ is the identity over the schematically dense open $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_k$, and $\mathcal{M}^1 \to \mathcal{M}$ is separated, so in fact $\mathbb{F}_k \circ \mathbb{E}_k$ is the identity. We also know that $\mathbb{E}_k$ is

surjective, and thus is bijective, in particular quasi-finite. Since $\mathcal{M}^1_k$ is separated we can apply Zariski's Main Theorem to deduce that $\mathbb{E}_k$ is the composite of an open immersion and a finite map. The open immersion is clearly an isomorphism, so $\mathbb{E}_k$ is finite. It is also a bijection, hence is radicial. It is locally of finite presentation, and the fact that $\mathbb{F}_k \circ \mathbb{E}_k$ is the identity allows one to easily deduce that $\mathbb{E}_k$ is formally étale, but a radicial étale morphism is an isomorphism.

Readers who are only interested in working over an algebraically closed field can stop here, but it is only a little more work to deduce the general case: we apply a fibrewise criterion, then repeat the above arguments. Firstly, the above result and the fibrewise criterion for flatness implies that $\mathbb{E}$ is flat. It is also an isomorphism on every geometric fibre, and hence is smooth. This implies (since smoothness is local on the source for the smooth topology, and $\mathcal{M}^1 \to \Lambda$ is smooth) that $\mathcal{E} \to \Lambda$ is smooth. In particular it is reduced, and $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}$ is dense in $\mathcal{E}$, so $\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}$ is 1-aligned, and we obtain a map $\mathbb{F}\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}^1$ as before. Separatedness of $\mathcal{M}^1$ implies that $\mathbb{F} \circ \mathbb{E}$ is the identity (since it is over $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}$). Applying Zariski's Main Theorem and formal étaleness just as above we deduce that $\mathbb{E}$ is an isomorphism as required. □

We can now reap the tasty fruits of our labour, as many nice properties of $\mathcal{E}$ follow from the same for $\mathcal{M}^1$.

Corollary 5.10.

1. *$\mathcal{E}$ is smooth over Λ;*
2. *$\mathcal{E}$ is separated over $\mathcal{M}$;*
3. *If $\mathring{\mathcal{J}} \to \mathring{\mathcal{M}}$ is the jacobian of the tautological smooth curve, then $\mathring{\mathcal{J}}$ admits a finite-type Néron model $\mathcal{N}$ over $\mathcal{E}$ (which is unique up to unique isomorphism);*
4. *If $t\colon T \to \mathcal{M}$ is any morphism from a regular scheme such that*
   - *$t^*\mathcal{C}$ is smooth over a dense open of T;*
   - *$t^*\mathcal{C}$ is 1-aligned;*

   then $t^*\mathcal{N}$ is the Néron model of $t^*\mathring{\mathcal{J}}$ (in particular, the Néron model exists).
5. *$\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}$ is in fact uniquely characterised by the above property - more precisely, it is the terminal object in the category of such morphism to $\mathcal{M}$.*
6. *The pullback of Caporaso's balanced Picard stack $\mathcal{P}_{d,g}$ to $\mathcal{E}$ acquires a natural group/torsor structure (see [Hol14, §13] for a precise statement).*

Proof. See [Hol14], and [Hol16b] for the quasi-compactness of the Néron model. □

Part II
Compactifying the stack of enriched structures

6 Defining compactified enriched structures

The problem of compactifying the moduli stack of enriched structures has been open since the work of Maino [Mai98]. Since enriched structures were only defined over fields prior to this work, this was always going to be a rather awkward problem. Maino considered building a compactification using 'bubbling', but this did not work as the boundary components were too large; looking back, we realise that Maino was seeing higher parts of the universal Néron-Model admitting stack $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ (see [Hol14]). While $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$ could be viewed as a compactification of the moduli stack of enriched structures for some purposes (for example, it satisfies a restricted version of the valuative criterion for properness), it is a very unsatisfactory compactification in other ways — since it is not proper over $\mathcal{M}$ it is not ideal for doing intersection theory etc. We will use the other common approach to compactifying moduli of line bundles: we will use torsion free sheaves of rank 1.

There are two main parts to our definition of an enriched structure. The first is to consider invertible quotients of pullback of certain carefully chosen ideal sheaves. This part is rather easily adapted to torsion free sheaves; we simply replace the requirement that the quotients be invertible by stipulating that they be torsion free of rank 1 (see definition 6.1 for a precise definition). The second part of the definition is to require that the tensor product of all these bundles be isomorphic (locally on S) to the trivial bundle. This does not work well with torsion free rank 1 sheaves; by definition, if a tensor product of sheaves is trivial then they are all invertible! To get around this, we show that the condition that the tensor product of the sheaves be trivial can be replaced by a condition on the shapes of the kernels of the quotient maps, see definition 6.13. We show that for line bundles this recovers our original definition (section 8), that for torsion-free rank 1 sheaves it defines a representable functor, and that the representing object is proper over $\mathcal{M}$.

Definition 6.1. Let C/k be a curve over a separably closed field, and let $j\colon C^{sm} \hookrightarrow C$ be the inclusion of the smooth locus. We say a coherent sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on C is *torsion free of rank 1* if

1. $j^*\mathscr{F}$ is locally free of rank 1 on C^{sm};

2. The canonical map $\mathscr{F} \to j_*j^*\mathscr{F}$ is injective.

Now let C/S be a curve over any base, and $\mathscr{F}$ a finitely presented quasi-coherent sheaf on C. We say $\mathscr{F}$ is *torsion free of rank 1* if $\mathscr{F}$ is S-flat and if for every geometric point $\bar{s} \to S$, the pullback $\mathscr{F}_{\bar{s}}$ on $C_{\bar{s}}$ is torsion free of rank 1 in the above sense.

This is one of many possible equivalent definitions. Such sheaves are very commonly used in compactifying moduli of invertible sheaves, see for example [MM64], [D'S79], [AK80], [Est01], [Cap08].

6.1 From relative components to hemispheres

If V is a subset of the vertices of a graph Γ, we say V is *connected* if the subgraph induced by V is connected. Recall that for us being connected means having exactly one connected component, in particular being non-empty.

Definition 6.2. Let Γ be a connected graph. A *hemisphere* of Γ is a connected subset G of the vertices of Γ such that the complement of G is also connected. We call the edges of Γ with exactly one end in G the *separating edges* of G.

In the first part of this paper we worked with invertible sheaves indexed by relative components (v, G) of Γ. We worked quite hard to prove that the set of enriched structures was empty if the family of curves was not 1-aligned, which was key in allowing us to define pullbacks of enriched structures since it essentially said that whenever it was unclear how to define the pullback the set of enriched structures was empty anyway, so there was no problem! With compactified enriched structures this strategy no longer works, since it is possible to have compactified enriched structures on families which are not 1-aligned (indeed, otherwise the valuative criterion for properness could not hold). To fix this we need to generalise the notion of relative component to allow V to be a connected set of vertices of Γ rather than just a single vertex. We could thus work with relative components (V, G) where V was simply a connected subgraph, but there would be a fair amount of redundancy since G would no longer determine V, so we could end up with two torsion free rank 1 quotients of the same ideal sheaf. The compatibility conditions we will impose in definition 6.13 can be phrased so as to require these quotients to be isomorphic, but this gets a little messy. Thus when defining compactified enriched structures we will work with hemispheres; the hemispheres of Γ are exactly those G that appear in these generalized relative components (V, G). Then setting the data of a compactified enriched structure to be a tuple of torsion free rank 1 quotients of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ for each hemisphere G avoids the redundancy having the same G appear with multiple V.

6.2 Enrichment data

In this section we define an enrichment datum on a σ-simple-controlled curve (to be defined in a moment). After this we will define what it means for such a datum to be *compatible*, and we will define a *compactified enriched structure* to be a compatible enrichment datum.

Definition 6.3. Let $S \to \mathcal{M}$ be a simple-controlled curve. Let $\mathfrak{s} \in S$ be a controlling point with graph Γ, and let $S \to U \to \mathcal{M}$ be a simple neighbourhood. Let $U_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be the largest open where Γ makes sense, so $S \to U$ factors via $U_{\mathfrak{s}} \to U$, and $U_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the immediate neighbourhood of S in U.

We say $S \to \mathcal{M}$ is *σ-simple-controlled* if for every irreducible component v of $C_{\mathfrak{s}}$ there exists a section $\sigma_v \colon U_{\mathfrak{s}} \to C_{U_{\mathfrak{s}}}$ passing through the smooth locus of v.

Note that we do *not* fix the section σ_v, so one cannot glue these to make sections over the whole of $\mathcal{M}$. Hence we are not imposing any additional restriction on $\mathcal{M}$; indeed, we have

Lemma 6.4. *σ-simple-controlled curves form a base for the big étale site over $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. We know this for simple-controlled curves by lemma 2.21, and it is standard that smooth morphisms admit sections étale-locally. □

This base for the étale site is where we will initially define compactified enriched structures - as before, we will use appendix A to then extend to the general case.

Situation 6.5. Let $S \to \mathcal{M}$ be a σ-simple-controlled curve. Let $\mathfrak{s} \in S$ be a controlling point with graph Γ, and let $S \xrightarrow{s} U \to \mathcal{M}$ be a simple neighbourhood. Let U_S be the immediate neighbourhood of S in U, so $S \to U$ factors via $U_S \to U$. Choose sections σ_v for each vertex v.

Definition 6.6. Suppose we are in Situation 6.5. Let G be a hemisphere of Γ. An *enrichment datum* for G is a torsion free rank 1 quotient

$$q_G \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G$$

such that on every fibre of C/S, the Euler characteristic of $\mathcal{F}_G$ is equal to the Euler characteristic of the structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_C$. We say two enrichment data $q_G \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G$ and $q'_G \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}'_G$ are *equivalent* if there exists an isomorphism $\psi_G \colon \mathscr{F}_G \to \mathscr{F}'_G$ making the obvious triangle commute.

An *enrichment datum for* Γ consists of an enrichment datum for every hemisphere of Γ, with a corresponding notion of isomorphism.

Remark 6.7.

1. We could perfectly well take quotients of $\mathcal{I}_G$ instead of $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$, but we choose the latter convention to be consistent with the first part of this paper (on the non-compactified case).

2. We have not used the sections σ_v yet; these will be needed for defining compatibility, and can be ignored in this section.

3. As in the case of enriched structures (see remark 2.26), one checks easily that these notions are independent of the choice of simple neighbourhood.

6.3 Local structure of pullbacks of ideal sheaves again

In this section we prove a generalisation of lemma 4.4, and some related results, which will be useful in what follows. Some of these results will make earlier results (such as lemma 4.4) redundant, but we have separated them out to reduce the technicalities encountered by the reader only interested in the non-compactified case. We start by recalling a result of Faltings on the local structure of torsion free rank 1 sheaves.

Lemma 6.8. *Let R be a local ring, C/R a simple-controlled curve, and $\mathscr{F}$ a torsion free rank 1 sheaf on C/R. Let e be an edge of the graph of C/S whose label is zero in R, and choose an isomorphism f from the R-algebra $A \coloneqq R[[x,y]]/(xy)$ to the completion of C along the section corresponding to e. Then there exist elements a, $b \in R$ with $ab = 0$ and an isomorphism of A-modules*

$$f^*\mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{A\langle U, V\rangle}{yU + aV, xV + bU}.$$

The elements a, b are clearly not unique — for example, if $f^*\mathscr{F}$ is invertible then we can take $a = 0$ and b to be any unit in R or vice versa.

Proof. This is a special case of theorem 3.5 of [Fal96], which treats also the case of non-constant degeneration and higher-rank torsion free sheaves. The authors are grateful to Emre Can Sertöz for pointing out this reference. □

We now give a slight generalisation of lemma 4.4.

Lemma 6.9. *Let C/S be a simple-controlled curve with graph Γ and $S \xrightarrow{s} U_S$ an immediate neighbourhood, and assume that S is local. Let G be a hemisphere of Γ, and assume that for every separating edge e of G, the label of e is 0 on S.*

Write C_G for the union of the irreducible components of C corresponding to vertices in G, and define C_{G^c} similarly, so that C is a fibred coproduct over S of C_G with C_{G^c} along the union of the sections of C/S corresponding to separating

edges of G. Write B_G for this union of sections, which we will also view as Cartier divisors on C_G or C_{G^c} interchangeably.

Let T_G be the torsion module on C_G given by

$$T = \bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_p^{\oplus (B_G - p)}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_p$ denotes the push forward to C_G along p of the structure sheaf of S. Then there exist isomorphisms

$$f_G \colon s^* I_{G^c}|_{C_G} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G, \tag{13}$$

$$f_{G^c} \colon s^* I_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \tag{14}$$

and for each $b \in B_G$

$$g_b \colon b^* \left(\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G \right) \to b^* \left(\bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \right)$$

such that for each $b \in B_G$ the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} b^* \left(\mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-B_G) \oplus T_G \right) & \xrightarrow{\qquad g_b \qquad} & b^* \left(\bigoplus_{p \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p) \right) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle b^* f_G} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle b^* f_{G^c}} \\ b^* s^* I_{G^c}|_{C_G} & = (s \circ b)^* I_{G^c} = & b^* s^* I_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}. \end{array}$$

Moreover, if we view the isomorphism g_b as being a morphism

$$b^* \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-b) \oplus \bigoplus_{B_G - b} \mathcal{O}_p \xrightarrow{\sim} b^* \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \oplus \bigoplus_{B_G - b} \mathcal{O}_p,$$

then g_b is the identity on the $\bigoplus_{B_G - b} \mathcal{O}_p$ parts, and induces an isomorphism $b^* \mathcal{O}_{C_G}(-b) \xrightarrow{\sim} b^* \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)$ (in particular g_b respects the evident direct sum decomposition).

Proof. The proof of lemma 4.4 carries over with little change. The notation is a little different since now G is a hemisphere instead of being part of a relative component, but this is unimportant for the proof. 'Points' becomes sections, but this again makes no real difference. Completions should be taken with respect to the defining ideal of the image of the section, which is no longer a maximal ideal, but this again does not make any difference. □

We now combine lemmas 6.8 and 6.9 to obtain more detailed information on the structure of enrichment data. This is the point in our story where the restriction on the Euler characteristic in the definition of enrichment data plays a key role.

Lemma 6.10. *In the notation of lemma 6.9, suppose $q\colon s^*\mathscr{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}$ is an enrichment datum for G. Write K for the kernel of q, and fix an isomorphism*

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{b\in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)$$

as in lemma 6.9.

1. *The coherent sheaf K is supported on C_{G^c}, and the restricted inclusion $K \to s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_{C_{G^c}}$ factors via the natural inclusion*

$$\bigoplus_{b\in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}} \to \bigoplus_{b\in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b)$$

2. *There exists an isomorphism $K|_{C_{G^c}} \cong \bigoplus_{\#e(G,G^c)-1} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$.*

3. *Choose an isomorphism as in (2). The induced map*

$$\bigoplus_{\#e(G,G^c)-1} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}} \to \bigoplus_{b\in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$$

   is given by a matrix with entries in $\mathcal{O}_S$.

4. *The quotient $\mathscr{F}$ is invertible at the point $b \in B_G$ if and only if the image of the bth standard basis vector of $\bigoplus_{b\in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$ in $\mathscr{F}$ is non-zero.*

Proof.

1. We check this locally at a singular section $p \in B_G$. We choose an isomorphism f from $A \coloneqq R[[x,y]]/(xy)$ to the completion of C along p as in lemma 6.8, assuming that x vanishes on the component corresponding to G^c. We also choose an isomorphism $f^*\mathscr{F}$ to $A\langle U,V\rangle/(yU+aV, xV+bU)$. We write

$$\bigoplus_{b\in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(b) \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{A}{x}\langle L_1,\dots,L_n\rangle \oplus A\langle X\rangle,$$

   where the L_i correspond to elements of $B_G \setminus p$ and X corresponds to the generator for $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}(p)$. The glueing conditions of lemma 6.9 then imply that X maps to a unit multiple of V, and each of the L_i maps to a unit multiple of yV. Thus if $\sum_I t_iL_i + sX$ maps to 0 under q, we must have that $y \mid s$. This proves the first claim.

2. Given $p \in B_G$, write $\mathbf{v}_p$ for the pth standard basis vector in $\bigoplus_{b \in B_G} \mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$. The submodule $\mathscr{V}$ of $\mathscr{F}|_{C_{G^c}}$ spanned by the images of the $\mathbf{v}_p$ is clearly invertible (by the computations in the proof of the first part); we claim that $\mathscr{V}$ has degree 0. This we can check on field-valued points of S, so we reduce to the case where S is a point. The structure of torsion free rank 1 sheaves is then very well understood, and the restriction that $\mathscr{F}$ have Euler characteristic equal to that of $\mathcal{O}_C$ implies that $\mathscr{V}$ has degree 0 as required.

   Knowing that $\mathscr{V}$ has degree 0 the result is very easy; the kernel K consists of relations between the $\mathbf{v}_p$, and such relations must then have coefficients in $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$, proving the claim.

3. This is immediate from (2) since C_{G^c} has connected fibres.

4. A torsion free rank 1 sheaf is invertible if and only if it is so on every fibre over S, so we reduce to the case where S is a geometric point. This is then an easy calculation since the structure of torsion free rank 1 sheaves on curves over fields is very well understood. □

Lemma 6.11. *Assume we are in Situation 6.5, and let G be a hemisphere of Γ. Let $q_G \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G$ be an enrichment datum with kernel K_G. Let σ be any section through the smooth locus of an irreducible component of $C_{\mathfrak{s}}$ corresponding to a vertex in G^c. Then σ^*K_G is supported on the closed subscheme of S cut out by the labels of separating edges of G.*

Note that if the section goes through the smooth locus of an irreducible component of $C_{\mathfrak{s}}$ corresponding to a vertex in G then $\sigma^*K_G = 0$ so the lemma would hold trivially.

Proof. This result is very clear set-theoretically , but we must do a modicum of work for the scheme-theoretic version. We may assume S and U_S are affine, say $S = \operatorname{Spec} B \to U = \operatorname{Spec} A$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ be the labels of the separating edges of G, and say a_i maps to $b_i \in B$. Then we find that $\sigma^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} = s^*(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ (since σ goes through G^c), so pulling back along σ yields a sequence

$$0 \to \sigma^*K_G \to \sigma^*(a_1, \dots, a_n) \to \sigma^*\mathscr{F}_G \to 0,$$

which is exact since $\mathscr{F}_G$ is flat over C in a neighbourhood of σ. This $\sigma^*\mathscr{F}_G$ is invertible (since $\mathscr{F}_G$ can only be non-invertible at non-smooth points of the fibres). Moreover, using that $\mathcal{M}$ has normal crossings singularities we see that

$$\sigma^*(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \frac{B\langle A_1, \dots, A_n \rangle}{(b_i A_j - b_j A_i : 1 \le i, j \le n)}.$$

To simplify notation write $\psi = \sigma^* q_G$. Since $\mathscr{F}_G$ is S-flat by assumption, we see that $\sigma^* K_G$ is still the kernel of ψ. Hence we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to \sigma^* K_G \to \frac{B\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n \rangle}{(b_i A_j - b_j A_i : 1 \leq i, j \leq n)} \xrightarrow{\psi} \sigma^* \mathscr{F}_G \to 0$$

where $\sigma^* \mathscr{F}_G$ is invertible, and we want to show $\sigma^* K_G$ is killed by every b_i.

Well, let $\sum_i c_i A_i \in \operatorname{Ker} \psi$. Note that $b_j \sum_i c_i A_i = \left(\sum_i b_i c_i\right) A_j$. Then

$$0 = b_j 0 = b_j \psi \left(\sum_i c_i A_i \right) = \left(\sum_i b_i c_i \right) \psi(A_j),$$

and since the $\psi(A_j)$ generate an invertible module this implies that $\sum_i b_i c_i = 0$. Then we see that

$$b_j \sum_i c_i A_i = \left(\sum_i b_i c_i \right) A_j = 0 A_j = 0$$

as required. □

6.4 Compatibility of enrichment data

Suppose we are in Situation 6.5 and have an enrichment datum for Γ. We need some analogue of the condition in the definition of an enriched structure that the tensor product of the invertible sheaves is trivial. There are two problems with applying that condition directly in our situation:

1. If a tensor product of sheaves is trivial then by definition they were all invertible, so we are not going to see very interesting torsion-free rank 1 sheaves!

2. Because we are working with hemispheres instead of relative components it is not completely clear which combinations of quotients we should require to be trivial.

In this section we construct a different condition, which satisfies two important properties (the proofs of which will take up much of the remainder of this paper):

1. If one restricts to invertible quotients, then the resulting notion of compactified enriched structure is naturally equivalent to our previous definition of enriched structure, and this makes the stack of enriched structures into an open substack of the stack of compactified enriched structures;

2. The resulting functor of compactified enriched structures is relatively representably by an algebraic space over $\mathcal{M}$, and moreover is proper over $\mathcal{M}$, making it a good notion of 'compactification'.

In future work we plan to show that the stack of compactified enriched structures is smooth over $\mathbb{Z}$, give a stratification of the boundary into smooth pieces, and show that the stack of enriched structures is dense in every fibre over $\mathcal{M}$, making it a very good compactification! Note that the boundary is *not* a normal crossings divisor for dimension reasons, cf. section 1.2 where we removed 2 points from the blowup of the completed affine plane.

We now begin the definition of compatibility. Suppose again that we are in Situation 6.5 and have an enrichment datum for Γ, so we have a torsion free rank 1 quotient $q_G \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G$ for every hemisphere G. Write K_G for the kernel of q_G, so we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \to K_G \to s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G \to 0$$

of coherent sheaves on C (for later use, note that the formation of the kernel commutes with base change by the S-flatness of $\mathscr{F}_G$). Write $\mathcal{J}_G$ for the ideal sheaf in U_S generated by the labels of separating edges of G. If $v \in G^c$ is any vertex then we have a canonical inclusion

$$\sigma_v^* K_G \hookrightarrow \sigma_v^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} = \mathcal{J}_G$$

of sheaves on S (using that $\mathscr{F}_G$ is C-flat in a neighbourhood of σ_v). We write $\mathbb{K}_G \coloneqq \sigma_v^* K_G$ for this submodule of $\mathcal{J}_G$; the notation is justified by

Lemma 6.12. *The submodule $\sigma_v^* K_G \subseteq \mathcal{J}_G$ is independent of the choice of component $v \in G^c$ and of the choice of section σ_v through the smooth locus of v.*

Proof. By lemma 6.11, the support of $\sigma^* K_G$ is contained in the zero locus $Z_S(\mathcal{J}_G)$ of $\mathcal{J}_G$ on S. Thus we may reduce to the case where all the labels vanish on the whole of S; equivalently, where the closed immersion $Z_S(\mathcal{J}_G) \to S$ is an isomorphism. The result is then clear from part 3 of lemma 6.10, since the inclusion of K in $s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is isomorphic to a linear map of free $\mathcal{O}_{C_{G^c}}$-modules with matrix entries in $\mathcal{O}_S$ (note that the Euler characteristic restriction is key in that lemma). □

Note that the above lemma is the only place where we need that $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ has normal crossings singularities. Thus if one were prepared to fix a section through the smooth locus of every irreducible component the normal crossing assumption could be ignored at least in defining compactified enriched structures. Requiring that the torsion free rank 1 quotients be invertible one would obtain a new notion of enriched structure; we do not know whether this is interesting.

Let A be a non-empty subset of the edges of Γ. Let $\mathcal{I}_A$ be the ideal sheaf on U_S cut out by the labels of edges in A. If G is a hemisphere of Γ such that the separating edges of G all lie in A then the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$ is contained in $\pi^*\mathcal{I}_A$ on

C_{U_S}. Pulling back along $\sigma_v \circ s$ for any $v \in G^c$ we obtain a map of coherent sheaves on S

$$f_{A,G} \colon \mathcal{J}_G = \sigma_v^* s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \to \sigma_v^* s^* \pi^* \mathcal{I}_A = s^* \mathcal{I}_A.$$

Definition 6.13. We say the enrichment datum is *compatible* if for every non-empty set A as above the closed immersion

$$\operatorname{Supp} \frac{s^* \mathcal{I}_A}{\sum_G f_{A,G}(\mathbb{K}_G)} \to S$$

is an isomorphism. Here the sum runs over hemispheres G such that every separating edge of G is contained in A, and Supp denotes the support of a coherent sheaf.

Definition 6.14. If C/S is σ-simple-controlled, a *compactified enriched structure* on C/S is a compatible enrichment datum on C/S.

Remark 6.15. This definition is independent of the choice of simple neighbourhood, and also that of the sections σ_v. For the former, see remark 6.7. The latter follows from lemma 6.12.

6.5 Pulling back compactified enriched structures

Suppose we are in Situation 6.5. Let $\varphi \colon T \to S$ be another σ-simple-controlled curve, and let $T \xrightarrow{t} U_T \hookrightarrow U_S$ be the immediate neighbourhood of T in U_S. We may take the sections on C_{U_T}/U_T to be induced by those from C_{U_S}/U_S. We have a pullback map $\varphi_\Gamma \colon \Gamma_S \to \Gamma_T$.

Lemma 6.16. *If H is a hemisphere of Γ_T then $\varphi_\Gamma^{-1} H$ is a hemisphere of Γ_S.*

Proof. Since φ_Γ^{-1} preserves intersections and emptiness it is enough to show that the pullback of a connected set is connected, but this is clear since φ_Γ simply contracts edges. □

If H is a hemisphere of Γ_T, let $G = \varphi_\Gamma^{-1} H$. Suppose we are given an enrichment datum

$$q_G \colon s^* \mathcal{I}_G \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G$$

for G. Note that $\varphi^* s^* \mathcal{I}_G = t^* \mathcal{I}_H$, and the pullback of a torsion free rank 1 sheaf is torsion free rank 1, and surjectivity is stable under pullback. We thus obtain an enrichment datum

$$q_H \coloneqq \varphi^* q_G \colon t^* \mathcal{I}_H \to \varphi^* \mathscr{F}_G.$$

In this way, we build an enrichment datum for C_T/T from one for C_S/S.

Lemma 6.17. *Let*

$$(q_G \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_G \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G)_G$$

be a compatible *enrichment datum for C/S. Then the pullback to T (as constructed above) is also compatible.*

Proof. Formation of pullbacks, quotients and support are compatible with base-change. Formation of kernels of surjections to *flat* targets are also compatible with base change. Thus the problems are essentially combinatorial.

Let B be a non-empty subset of the edges of Γ_T. Let A be the set of edges of Γ_S which map to edges in B (so in particular $\#A = \#B$). Let H be a hemisphere of B with all separating edges of H contained in B. Then every separating edge of $\varphi_\Gamma^{-1}H$ is contained in A, since it maps to a separating edge of H. Conversely, if G is a hemisphere of Γ_S with every separating edge of G contained in A then G is the pullback of a hemisphere from Γ_T; indeed, any vertex v of $\varphi_\Gamma^{-1}\varphi_\Gamma(G)$ which is not contained in G must be connected to some vertex of G by a chain of edges which are all contracted by φ, but then none of these edges are in A, contradicting the existence of such a v.

In this way we see that φ_Γ^{-1} induces a bijection between hemispheres of Γ_T with all separating edges in B and hemispheres of Γ_S with all separating edges in A. Thus in the notation of definition 6.13 we see that

$$\varphi^* \frac{s^*\mathcal{I}_A}{\sum_G f_{A,G}(\mathbb{K}_G)} = \frac{t^*\mathcal{I}_B}{\sum_H f_{B,H}(\mathbb{K}_H)}$$

where the sums run over the relevant sets of hemispheres discussed above. The result is clear since the formation of the support of a coherent module commutes with pullback, [Sta13, Lemma 056J]. □

Definition 6.18. Write σ-$\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathcal{M}}$ for the full subcategory of schemes over $\mathcal{M}$ whose objects are σ-simple-controlled curves. Then by lemma 6.4 this is a base for the étale topology on $\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Let $\bar{\mathcal{E}} \colon \sigma\text{-}\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathcal{M}}^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$ be the functor sending a curve to the set of compactified enriched structures on it, with the pullback defined just above. This is the *functor of compactified enriched structures* on the subcategory of σ-simple-controlled curves.

6.6 Compactified enriched structures for general C/S, and properties

To define compactified enriched structures for general (not necessarily σ-simple-controlled) C/S we need to show the functor of compactified enriched structures defined in definition 6.18 is a sheaf for the étale topology (as in section 2.4). As

in the non-compactified case we will make use of a representability result for a related functor, so we begin by defining some functors related to $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$.

Let C/S be a σ-simple-controlled curve, with graph Γ, simple neighbourhood $S \to U$ and immediate neighbourhood $S \xrightarrow{s} U_S \subseteq U$. If G is a hemisphere of Γ, let

$$\mathcal{ED}_{S,G} \colon \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$$

be the functor sending an S-scheme $T \xrightarrow{f} S$ to the set of isomorphism classes of torsion free rank 1 quotients of $f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}$, with the evident notion of pullback. Let

$$\mathcal{ED}_S \colon \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$$

be the fibre product over S of the functors $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ as G runs over hemispheres of Γ. Note that $\mathcal{ED}_S(S)$ is exactly the set of enrichment data on S. Finally, let

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_S \colon \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$$

be the subfunctor of $\mathcal{ED}_S$ obtained by requiring that the enrichment data are compatible. More precisely, we choose sections σ_v of C_S/S through the smooth locus of each irreducible component v of any controlling fibre, and define $\mathbb{K}_G$ to be the pullback to T along $f^*\sigma_v$ (any $v \in G^c$) of the kernel of $q_G \colon f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \to \mathcal{F}_G$. We then require that for each non-empty set A of edges of Γ, the inclusion of the support of the coherent $\mathcal{O}_T$-module

$$\frac{f^*s^*\mathcal{I}_A}{\sum_G \mathbb{K}_G} \tag{15}$$

to T is an isomorphism (the sum running over those G all of whose separating edges are contained in A). Again, if $S = T$ we immediately see that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_S(S) = \bar{\mathcal{E}}(S)$.

We made similar definitions in the non-compactified case, but here things are actually much simpler; we do not have to worry about 1-alignment, instead we have a very general lemma:

Lemma 6.19. *For all σ-simple-controlled $T/\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}$-maps $T \to S$, we have that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_S(T) = \bar{\mathcal{E}}(T)$.*

More precisely, the discussion in the proof of lemma 6.17 gives an obvious map $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_S(T) \to \bar{\mathcal{E}}(T)$, and we will prove that this is an isomorphism.

Proof. This almost comes from looking at the proof of lemma 6.17. The only extra thing we need to observe is that if A is a nonempty set of edges of $\Gamma = \Gamma_S$ which does not come by pullback from the graph Γ_T of C_T/T (equivalently, at least one edge in A is contracted under the map to Γ_T) then $f^*s^*\mathcal{J}_A$ is canonically trivial, and all the images of relevant $\mathbb{K}_G$ in it are zero, so the quotient in (15) is trivially supported on the whole of T. □

Lemma 6.20.

1. *For each hemisphere G of Γ, the functor $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}\colon \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$ is representable by a separated S-scheme.*
2. *The functor $\mathcal{ED}_S\colon \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$ is representable by a separated S-scheme.*
3. *The functor $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_S\colon \mathbf{Sch}_S^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$ is representable by a separated S-scheme.*

Proof. For (1), we note that $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ is naturally a subfunctor of a quot scheme. The inclusion of this subfunctor is moreover relatively representable, since the inclusion of torsion free rank 1 sheaves in the stack of all finitely presented sheaves is relatively representable, and fixing the Euler characteristic is an open and closed condition. We thus see that $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ is representable, and we need to check separatedness. All the torsion free rank 1 quotients appearing as G-enrichment data have the same Hilbert polynomial (because they are required to have the same Euler characteristic), and thus $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ is a subfunctor of a quot functor for a fixed Hilbert polynomial. Such a functor satisfies the valuative criterion for properness with respect to discrete valuation rings by [FGI+05, §5.5.7]. Moreover, since C/S and the various ideal sheaves we consider are of finite presentation we can reduce to the case where S is noetherian, so $\mathcal{ED}_{S,G}$ is a subfunctor of a separated functor.

Part (2) holds since a product of separated schemes is a separated scheme. The third functor is represented by the support of a suitably chosen coherent sheaf on the second, and so is again representable and separated. □

Corollary 6.21. *The functor $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is a sheaf for the étale topology.*

Proof. We need to show that if C/S is a σ-simple-controlled curve, $\{T_i\}_I \to S$ is an étale cover by σ-simple-controlled curves, and for each $i, j \in I$ we have a cover $\{T_{i,j,k}\}_{K_{i,j}}$ of $T_i \times_S T_j$ by σ-simple-controlled curves, then the following diagram is an equaliser:

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}(S) \to \prod_i \bar{\mathcal{E}}(T_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j,k} \bar{\mathcal{E}}(T_{i,j,k}). \tag{16}$$

However, for such T we know that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(T) = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_S(T)$ and that the functor $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_S$ is representable, and hence a sheaf for any subcanonical topology. □

Definition 6.22. By lemma A.4 the sheaf $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ extends uniquely to a sheaf on the big étale site over $\mathcal{M}$. We denote this extension also by $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$, and call it the functor of compactified enriched structures.

Corollary 6.23. *The functor $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is representable by a separated algebraic space over $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. By definition $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is a sheaf, so we can check representability locally on $\mathcal{M}$, say on σ-simple-controlled patches. The result is then immediate by combining lemma 6.19 and part (3) of lemma 6.20. The separatedness follows by again applying part (3) of lemma 6.20, using that separatedness is local on the target (see [Sta13, Section 02YJ]). □

7 Properness of the stack of compactified enriched structures

Properness is fpqc-(hence étale-)local on the target, so we may assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a scheme and $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ is σ-simple-controlled with graph Γ. Then $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is a closed subscheme of the fibre product over $\mathcal{M}$ of functors $\mathcal{ED}_{\mathcal{M},H}$ as H runs over hemispheres of Γ, so it is enough to show that each $\mathcal{ED}_{\mathcal{M},H}$ is proper over $\mathcal{M}$. Fixing a hemisphere H, we will construct an isomorphism between $\mathcal{ED}_{\mathcal{M},H}$ and the blowup of $\mathcal{M}$ at the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{J}_H$ (generated by labels of separating edges of H), which is clearly proper over $\mathcal{M}$.

Let σ be a section through the smooth locus of $\mathcal{C}/\mathcal{M}$ passing through a component in H^c. If $s\colon S \to \mathcal{M}$ is any scheme then an object of $\mathcal{ED}_{\mathcal{M},H}$ is a torsion-free rank 1 quotient

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_H,$$

and pulling back along σ we obtain an invertible quotient

$$s^*\mathcal{J}_H \to \sigma^*\mathscr{F}_H$$

(here we abuse notation as usual — the section σ is over $\mathcal{M}$, but we pull it back to make a section of C_S/S, and use the same notation for this new section). We thus obtain a natural transformation from torsion-free rank 1 quotients of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ on $\mathcal{C}_S$ to invertible quotients of $s^*\mathcal{J}_H$ on S.

Lemma 7.1. *The above natural transformation is an isomorphism of functors* $\mathbf{Sch}_{\mathcal{M}}^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$.

Proof. For each $\mathcal{M}$-scheme S we must prove that the map from torsion-free rank 1 quotients of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ to invertible quotients of $s^*\mathcal{J}_H$ above is a bijection. Since both sides are representable functors it is enough to check this in the case where S is the spectrum of a complete local ring. Write $R = \mathcal{O}_S(S)$.

Let $Z \rightarrowtail \mathcal{M}$ be the closed subscheme where the labels of the separating edges of H vanish (so Z is cut out by $\mathcal{J}_H$). Suppose we are given an invertible quotient $q\colon s^*\mathcal{J}_H \twoheadrightarrow R$. Write $\mathbb{K}$ for the kernel. Our first task will be to construct a corresponding submodule K of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$, and then to show that the cokernel of $K \to$

$s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ is torsion free of rank 1. In this way we will construct an inverse to the 'pullback along σ' map above, showing that the map of functors is an isomorphism (we will leave it to the reader to check that the map we define is actually an inverse).

Step 1: Constructing K

Let $\iota\colon V(H^c) \rightarrowtail C_S$ be the closed subscheme corresponding to H^c as in definition 2.22. Then $\pi_{H^c}\colon V(H^c) \to Z$ is proper and flat, and we define $K = \iota_*\pi_{H^c}^*\mathbb{K}$ (noting that $\mathbb{K}$ is supported on Z by a simpler analogue of lemma 6.11).

Step 2: Constructing a map from K to $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$

Let $U_H = C_S \setminus V(H^c)$. Then K is zero on U_H, so the map to $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ on U_H is clear. Write $\pi\colon C_S \to S$ for the structure map. If we let $V(H)$ be as defined in definition 2.22 (so $C_Z = V(H) \cup V(H^c)$) and set $U_{H^c} = C_S \setminus V(H)$, then on U_{H^c} we find that $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_{U_{H^c}} = \pi^*s^*\mathcal{J}_H|_{U_{H^c}}$ and $\pi^*\mathbb{K}|_{U_{H^c}} = K|_{U_{H^c}}$, so again the map is clear. Moreover, these two maps agree on the intersection of U_H and U_{H^c}.

However, we are not done yet, since we also need to define a (compatible) map in a neighbourhood of the sections corresponding to separating edges of H. Fix such an edge e. In order to write down our map (and for later calculations) we need to give presentations of the various modules involved. We may assume $\mathcal{M}$ is affine and that the labels of separating edges of H are principal ideals on $\mathcal{M}$. Number the separating edges $e = e_0, \dots, e_n$. Choose a generator ℓ_i for each separating edge i. From now on we will work locally at the completion of C_S at a point in the singular subscheme corresponding to e. We see that

$$s^*\mathcal{J}_H = \frac{R\langle L_0, \dots, L_n\rangle}{\ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i : 0 \le i, j \le n}.$$

Writing A for the completion of C_S along e, we choose an isomorphism $A \cong R[[x,y]]/(xy - \ell_0)$, and let us assume that x vanishes on the component lying in H. Then we find

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c} = \frac{A\langle X, L_0, \dots, L_n\rangle}{yX - L_0, \ell_i X - xL_i, \ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i : 0 \le i, j \le n}.$$

Recalling that $q\colon s^*\mathcal{J}_H \twoheadrightarrow R$ is the invertible quotient we started with, we set $q_i \coloneqq q(L_i)$. We see that

$$\mathbb{K} = \left\{ \sum_{i\ge 0} \alpha_i L_i \colon \sum_{i\ge 0} \alpha_i q_i = 0 \right\} \subseteq s^*\mathcal{J}_H.$$

Then

$$K = \left\{ \sum_{i\ge 0} \alpha_i L_i \colon \sum_{i\ge 0} \alpha_i q_i = 0 \right\} \subseteq \frac{R[[y]]\langle L_0, \dots, L_n\rangle}{\ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i : 0 \le i, j \le n}.$$

It is then clear how to define the map $K \to s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$; simply send $(\sum_{j\geq 0} r_j y^j)L_i$ to the same symbol considered an an element of $A\langle L_0, \ldots, L_n\rangle$. The compatibility with the maps defined above on U_H and U_{H^c} is also clear.

Step 3: Verifying that the cokernel is torsion free rank 1

We have built a map $K \to s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$, and need to check that the cokernel is torsion free of rank 1 and of the correct Euler characteristic. The fibrewise part of this is a straightforward calculation, and is omitted. The hard part is checking that this cokernel is flat over R. Writing M for the cokernel, we have a presentation

$$M = \frac{A\langle X, L_0, \ldots, L_n\rangle}{yX - L_0, \ell_i X - xL_i, \ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), K}.$$

We want to show M is R-flat. From the constructions this is clear away from points in the closed subscheme corresponding to the section e. This subscheme is contained in the subscheme cut out by the equation $x - y = 0$. We wish to apply lemma 7.2 with $a = x - y$ to check flatness. The lemma does not apply directly because the finite presentation assumptions fail, so we apply the lemma *before* completing along e, and then observe that the properties we need to check can be verified *after* completion. Hence it is enough to check the following:

1. $M/(x-y)M$ is flat over R;
2. $(x-y)\colon M \to M$ is injective.

Step 4: Flatness of $M/(x-y)M$

This is rather easy from the presentation; as R-modules we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{M}{(x-y)M} &= \frac{R[[x]]}{(x^2 - \ell_0)} \frac{\langle X, L_0, \ldots, L_n\rangle}{xX - L_0, \ell_i X - xL_i, \ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), K} \\
&= \frac{R\langle X, L_0, L_1, \ldots, L_n, xX, xL_0, xL_1, \ldots, xL_n\rangle}{xX - L_0, \ell_i X - xL_i, \ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), K} \\
&\cong \frac{R\langle X, L_0, \ldots, L_n\rangle}{\ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \leq i, j \leq n), K} \\
(\text{via } q) &= R\langle X\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

which is evidently R-flat!

Step 5: Injectivity of $(x-y)\colon M \to M$

Let $\mathbb{L}$ be the sub-A-module of M generated by the L_i. By a small diagram chase, it is enough to show

1. $(x-y)\colon \mathbb{L} \to \mathbb{L}$ is injective;
2. $(x-y)\colon M/\mathbb{L} \to M/\mathbb{L}$ is injective

For (1), we observe first that we have a presentation

$$\mathbb{L} = \frac{A\langle L_0, \dots, L_n\rangle}{\ell_i L_j - \ell_j L_i (0 \le i, j \le n), \mathbb{K}},$$

so $\mathbb{L} \cong A$ as an A-module (via the map q), and so multiplication by $(x - y)$ is easily seen to be injective. For (2), it is clear from the presentations that $M/\mathbb{L}$ is again isomorphic as an A-module to A, and so injectivity again follows.

In conclusion, we have shown how to build a torsion free rank 1 quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ starting from an invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{J}_H$. To show bijectivity, it remains to check that this is actually an inverse of the 'pull back along σ' map, but this is not hard and we omit it. □

The key technical result we used above was the following beautiful lemma whose statement and proof are adapted from [Ore14, lemma 1.2.2].

Lemma 7.2. *Let R be a ring, A a finitely presented R-algebra, and M a finitely presented A module. Let $a \in A$. Suppose*

1. *M/aM is flat over R;*
2. *$a\colon M \to M$ is injective.*

Then for every point $q \in Z(a) \subseteq \operatorname{Spec} A$, the localisation M_q is flat over R.

Proof. **Step 1:** There is an obvious exact sequence

$$0 \to \frac{aM}{a^2M} \to \frac{M}{a^2M} \to \frac{M}{aM} \to 0.$$

Now $a\colon M \to aM$ is a bijection by (2), hence $\frac{aM}{a^2M} \cong \frac{M}{aM}$ as A-modules, so by (1) the module $\frac{aM}{a^2M}$ is R-flat, hence $\frac{M}{a^2M}$ is R-flat. Repeating this argument, we deduce that $\frac{M}{a^nM}$ is R-flat for all $n \ge 1$.
Step 2: Fix a point $q \in Z(a) \subseteq \operatorname{Spec} A$, and let $p \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ be its pullback. Write A_q for the localisation of A at q, R_p for the localisation of R at p, and $M_q = M \otimes_A A_q$. We need to show M_q is flat over R_p. By [Sta13, Tag 00HD] this is equivalent to checking that for all finitely generated ideals $I \triangleleft R_p$, the canonical map $I \otimes_{R_p} M_q \to M_q$ is injective. For each integer $n \ge 1$ consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I \otimes_{R_p} M_q & \longrightarrow & M_q \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_n} & & \downarrow \\ I \otimes_{R_p} \left(\frac{M_q}{a^n M_q}\right) & \hookrightarrow & \frac{M_q}{a^n M_q}, \end{array}$$

where the bottom arrow is injective by the R-flatness of $\frac{M}{a^n M}$ established above. We need to show the top horizontal arrow is injective; for this we will show that $\bigcap_{n\geq 1} \operatorname{Ker} \varphi_n = 0$. Note that

$$I \otimes_{R_p} \left(\frac{M_q}{a^n M_q} \right) = \frac{I \otimes_{R_p} M_q}{a^n (I \otimes_{R_p} M_q)},$$

and so $\operatorname{Ker} \varphi_n = a^n (I \otimes_{R_p} M_q)$. Hence we want to show that $N = 0$ where

$$N \coloneqq \bigcap_{n\geq 1} a^n (I \otimes_{R_p} M_q).$$

If R (and hence A) is Noetherian we can use the Artin-Rees lemma; let $P \coloneqq I \otimes_{R_p} M_q$, then Artin-Rees tells us that there exists an $m \geq 0$ such that

$$(a^{m+1} P) \cap N = a((a^m P) \cap N),$$

in other words that $N = aN$, so by Nakayama's lemma (using that $a \in q$) we have that $N = 0$ as required.

To extend to the general (non-Noetherian) case one uses [Sta13, Tag 00R1 and Tag 00R6]; more details are in [Ore14, lemma 1.2.2]. □

We have established an isomorphism of functors between $\mathcal{ED}_{\mathcal{M},H}$ and the functor of invertible quotients of $\mathcal{J}_H$, the latter being defined entirely in terms of $\mathcal{M}$ with no reference to the curve living over it. We still need to show that this latter functor is proper.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $Q \colon \mathbf{Sch}^{op}_{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathbf{Set}$ be the functor sending a scheme $s \colon S \to \mathcal{M}$ to the set of invertible quotients of $s^* \mathcal{J}_H$. This functor is naturally equivalent to the functor of points of the blowup of $\mathcal{M}$ along $\mathcal{J}_H$; in particular it is proper.*

Proof. The blowup $B \to \mathcal{M}$ is by definition the Proj of the blowup algebra, whose functor of points is spelled out in [Sta13, Section 01NS] (note that the blowup algebra is generated in degree 1). In our situation, for a scheme $s \colon S \to \mathcal{M}$, we see that $B(S)$ is the set of equivalence classes of invertible quotients of $s^* \mathcal{J}_H \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}$ such that for every integer $d > 0$, the induced surjection $s^* \operatorname{Sym}^d(\mathcal{J}_H) \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}$ factors via $s^*(\mathcal{J}_H^d)$. However, recall that $\mathcal{J}_H$ is assumed to correspond to a normal crossings divisor in $\mathcal{M}$, and so this latter condition is vacuous, so the blowup is simply the functor of invertible quotients of $\mathcal{J}_H$. □

8 Comparison to enriched structures

There are three key differences between enriched structures and compactified enriched structures:

1. Enriched structures are built from invertible sheaves, whereas compactified enriched structures are built from torsion free rank 1 sheaves;

2. For an enriched structures we specify one quotient for each relative component of Γ, whereas for compactified enriched structures we specify one quotient for each hemisphere of Γ.

3. For enriched structures we require that the tensor product of the invertible sheaves be trivial, whereas for compactified enriched structures we have a rather complicated compatibility condition in terms of the supports of certain modules.

Suppose we have a compactified enriched structure where all the torsion free rank 1 quotients are in fact invertible. By throwing out the $\mathscr{F}_G$ where G is not a connected component of the complement of a single vertex we obtain a collection of data which is a reasonable candidate to be an enriched structure - we just need to check that the tensor product of the invertible sheaves is trivial, which we will do in the next sections. In this way we have a map from the 'invertible locus' of compacted enriched structures to enriched structures, which clearly behaves well with pullbacks, giving a map of functors. We will verify that this map is an isomorphism, and hence that the invertible locus of the stack of compactified enriched structures is canonically identified with the stack of enriched structures.

Definition 8.1. Let C/S be σ-simple-controlled. We say an enrichment datum on C/S is *invertible* if each of the torsion free rank 1 quotients is in fact an invertible sheaf. Similarly, we say a compactified enriched structure is *invertible* if the underlying enrichment datum is invertible.

A *vertex-enrichment datum* is the same data as an enrichment datum, except that we restrict to hemispheres G which are connected components of the complements of single vertices. There is an obvious parallel notion of an invertible vertex-enrichment datum. We say an invertible vertex-enrichment datum is $\otimes$-*compatible* if the tensor product of all the invertible sheaves is S-locally trivial. We say it is *supp-compatible* if it satisfies the analogue of definition 6.13.

Thus a '$\otimes$-compatible invertible vertex-enrichment datum' is exactly the same thing as an enriched structure as defined in definition 2.25!

A vertex enrichment datum is easily obtained from an enrichment datum by forgetting some of the data. This clearly preserves invertibility, and sends a compatible enrichment datum to a supp-compatible vertex enrichment datum. We need to show two things:

1. Every supp-compatible invertible vertex enrichment datum is $\otimes$-compatible.

2. The resulting functor from invertible compactified enriched structures to enriched structures is an equivalence.

We will actually prove these in a very roundabout way. This is essentially because the case of non-integral base schemes is rather hard to handle, so instead we sidestep it by proving that the stack of invertible compactified enriched structures is regular. We first prove the result in the case where all labels vanish, then deduce the result for integral base schemes, and then finally deduce the general case.

8.1 When all the labels vanish

Suppose we are in Situation 6.5. Suppose moreover that all the labels on all edges in Γ are zero, and that S is local, let $R \coloneqq \mathcal{O}_S(S)$. Shrinking U slightly we can assume that U is affine, and the closures in U of the closed subschemes of $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{U,\mathfrak{s}}$ cut out by labels of edges in Γ are cut out by principal ideals of $\mathcal{O}_U(U)$; we will often think of these principal ideals as the labels. We choose once and for all a generator of each principal ideal; say the edge e has as label the principal ideal generated by l_e (so all the l_e vanish on the image of S in U_S).

Let $\tilde{C}$ be the blowup of C along the union of the sections corresponding to edges, and for each vertex v let C_v be the connected component of $\tilde{C}$ containing v, so that C is the fibred coproduct of the C_v along the union of the sections corresponding to edges.

We begin by fixing an invertible compactified enrichment datum $\mathfrak{E} \coloneqq (q_G \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G)_G$ on C/S. It is clear that if $\mathfrak{E}$ is compatible then the corresponding vertex enrichment datum $\mathfrak{E}_{vert}$ is supp-compatible.

We need to show that the invertible vertex-enriched structure $\mathfrak{E}_{vert}$ is $\otimes$-compatible. It is enough to check this compatibility on each non-loop circuit-connected component of Γ separately, so we fix such a component A of Γ and let $E(A)$ be the set of its edges and $V(A)$ the set of its vertices. Given $v \in V$ there is a unique relative component (v, G) such that G intersects A; we write $\pi(A)$ for the set of these relative components, so we can write the invertible vertex-enriched structure we obtain as $(q_G \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G)_{(v,G)\in\pi(A)}$. If $(v, G) \in \pi(A)$ we write $e(v, G)$ for the set of edges from v to G, which we also think of as a set of sections of C_S/S.

A *local trivialisation* of this invertible vertex-enriched structure consists of, for each $(v, G) \in \pi(A)$, a choice of isomorphism $f_G \colon \mathscr{F}_G|_{C_v} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{C_v}(e(v, G))$ (here we are thinking of $e(v, G)$ as a horizontal Cartier divisor on C_v). For every vertex $u \in V(A) \setminus \{v\}$, the coherent sheaf $s^* \mathcal{I}_u|_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}$ is canonically trivial (it corresponds to an ideal sheaf whose closed subscheme does not meet this locus),

so our choice of f_G induces a map

$$F_G \colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \otimes \bigotimes_{H \neq G} s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}\Big|_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)} \to \mathcal{O}_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}.$$

Let $\pi_C \colon C \to S$ be the structure map. For each $e \in e(v, G)$ we note that $F_G(e) \coloneqq F_G(l_e \otimes 1 \cdots \otimes 1)$ lies in $\pi_C^{-1}\mathcal{O}_S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}(C_v \setminus e(v, G))$ (cf. lemma 6.10), and is a unit since $\mathscr{F}_G$ is invertible (again by lemma 6.10). If $(u, H) \in \pi(A)$ is another relative component, we say F_G and F_H *match up* if for every edge e from u to v, we have that $F_G(e) = F_H(e)$.

Lemma 8.2. *The following are equivalent:*

1. *For all $(v, G), (u, H) \in \pi(A)$, the maps F_G and F_H match up.*
2. *There exists an isomorphism $\Phi \colon \bigotimes_{v \in V(A)} \mathscr{F}_G \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_C$ such that for each $(v, G) \in \pi(A)$, the restriction to $C_V \setminus e(v, G)$ of the composite*

$$\bigotimes_{(u,H) \in \pi(A)} s^*I_{H^c} \xrightarrow{\otimes q_G} \bigotimes_{(u,H) \in \pi(A)} \mathscr{F}_G \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathcal{O}_A$$

   is equal to F_G.

Proof. Let $e \colon u - v$ be an edge in A, with (v, G) and $(u, H) \in \pi(A)$. Recall that $R = \mathcal{O}_S(S)$, define $A \coloneqq R[[x, y]]/(xy)$, and fix an isomorphism between A and the completion of C_S along the section corresponding to e, such that x vanishes on the component corresponding to v. Then we have natural isomorphisms

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_A = \frac{A\langle X, L_e, B_1, \ldots, B_n\rangle}{yX - L_e, xB_1, \ldots, xB_n},$$

where L_e is a generator corresponding to the label generator l_e, and $B_1, \ldots, B_n$ correspond to the labels of the other edges from v to G. Similarly we have

$$s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_A = \frac{A\langle Y, L_e, C_1, \ldots, C_m\rangle}{xY - L_e, yC_1, \ldots, yC_m}.$$

Tensoring the above presentations together we obtain a presentation for the A-module

$$M \coloneqq s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c}|_A \otimes_A s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}|_A.$$

Note that the restrictions of the $s^*\mathcal{I}_{F^c}$ for $F \notin \{G, H\}$ are canonically trivial, so we can ignore them. The condition (2) is then equivalent to the existence of an A-module map $\Psi \colon M \to A$ satisfying the following two conditions:

- after inverting x, the map Ψ sends $\frac{X}{x} \otimes L_e$ to $F_H(e)$;
- after inverting y, the map Ψ sends $L_e \otimes \frac{Y}{y}$ to $F_G(e)$.

We now move to proving the lemma. Suppose first that (1) holds. Then we construct a map Ψ as above by sending

- $X \otimes Y$ to $F_G(e) = F_H(e)$;
- $L_e \otimes Y$ to $yF_G(e)$;
- $X \otimes L_e$ to $xF_H(e)$;
- $B_i \otimes Y$ to $yF_G(1 \otimes \cdots \otimes l_i \otimes \cdots \otimes 1)$;
- $X \otimes C_j$ to $xF_H(1 \otimes \cdots \otimes l_j \otimes \cdots \otimes 1)$;
- $B_i \otimes C_j$ to 0.

It is straightforward to verify that this map is well-defined.

Conversely, suppose (2) holds. Then we have a map Ψ as above. After inverting y we find that

$$\Psi_y(X \otimes Y) = \Psi_y(yX \otimes \frac{Y}{y}) = \Psi_y(L_e \otimes \frac{Y}{y}) = F_G(e),$$

and after inverting x we find

$$\Psi_x(X \otimes Y) = \Psi_x(\frac{X}{x} \otimes xY) = \Psi_x(\frac{X}{x} \otimes L_e) = F_H(e)$$

which implies that $F_H(e) = F_G(e)$. □

Lemma 8.3. *With A as above, the following are equivalent:*

1. *There exists $(t_G)_{(v,G)\in\pi(A)} \in (\mathcal{O}_S^\times)^{\pi(A)}$ such that for all pairs of relative components (u, H), (v, G) we have that $t_G F_G$ matches up with $t_H F_H$ (where the multiplication is just composition with the obvious scaling);*
2. *There exists an isomorphism $\bigotimes_{(v,G)\in\pi(A)} \mathscr{F}_G \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_C$.*

Proof. Suppose (1) holds. Then (2) follows immediately from (1 $\implies$ 2) of lemma 8.2.

Conversely, suppose (2) holds. Then define F'_G for $(v, G) \in \pi(A)$ by composing $\otimes q_G$ with the given isomorphism — these match up by (2 $\implies$ 1) of lemma 8.2. Then for each (v, G), the maps F_G and F'_G are related by an automorphism of $\mathcal{O}_S$ acting on $\mathcal{O}_{C_v \setminus e(v,G)}$, and we define t_G such that multiplication by it is that automorphism. □

Let $(v, G) \in \pi(A)$ be a relative component, and define $F_G(e)$ for $e \in e(v, G)$ as above - this depends on the choice of trivialisation f_G. If we have chosen a different trivialisation (say f'_G) then this would differ from f_G by multiplication by a unit in $R = \mathcal{O}_S(S)$, and so the resulting $F_G(e)$ would differ by the same scalar. As such, the free rank 1 R-submodule of $\oplus_{e(v,G)} R$ spanned by $(F_G(e))_{e \in e(v,G)}$ is independent of the choice of f_G, and we denote it by L_G.

Since we have chosen generators for the labels of edges in U_S, we obtain a canonical identification of R-modules $s^*\mathcal{J}_G \xrightarrow{\sim} \oplus_{e(v,G)} R$. The later module has a canonical basis and is thus naturally isomorphic to its dual. In this way we obtain an identification between $\oplus_{e(v,G)} R$ and the dual of $s^*\mathcal{J}_G$ (here by 'dual' of a module N we mean $\mathrm{Hom}(N, R)$ as an R-module, and we write it $N^\vee$). This construction feels very ad-hoc, but really it was the choice of the generators l_e that was ad-hoc. The construction is justified by the next lemma.

Lemma 8.4. *Applying $- \mapsto \mathrm{Hom}_{R-mod}(-, R)$ to the exact sequence*

$$0 \to \mathbb{K}_G \to s^* J_G \to \sigma^* \mathscr{F}_G \to 0$$

yields an exact sequence

$$0 \to (\sigma^* \mathscr{F}_G)^\vee \to \oplus_{e(v,G)} R \to \mathbb{K}_G^\vee \to 0,$$

and the submodule $(\sigma^* \mathscr{F}_G)^\vee \to \oplus_{e(v,G)} R$ is exactly the submodule L_G defined above.

Proof. Each term in the first sequence is free as an R-module, and so dualising preserves exactness. The second assertion is a straightforward computation. □

Lemma 8.5. *With A as above, the following are equivalent:*

1. *There exists $(t_G)_{(v,G) \in \pi(A)} \in (\mathcal{O}_S^\times)^{\pi(A)}$ such that for all pairs of relative components (u, H), (v, G) we have that $t_G F_G$ matches up with $t_H F_H$ (where the multiplication is just composition with the obvious scaling).*

2. *The invertible vertex enrichment datum $(q_G \colon s^* I_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_G)_{(v,G)}$ is A-supp-compatible.*

Proof. In this proof, when we write $\sum \mathbb{K}_G$ the sum runs over $(v, G) \in \pi(A)$, and we write $F_v = F_G$ if $(v, G) \in \pi(A)$ (note v determines G and vice versa by circuit connectivity of A). Using lemma 8.4 we can construct a presentation for $\frac{s^* J_A}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G}$ using the $F_G(e)$; we find

$$\frac{s^* J_A}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G} = \frac{\bigoplus_{v \in V(A)} R\langle V \rangle}{\langle F_u(e)V - F_v(e)U \text{ for } e \colon u - v \text{ in } A \rangle}.$$

Now pick any $v_0 \in V(A)$ as a basepoint. If γ is a directed path in A from v_0 back to v_0, then when we write

$$\prod_{\gamma} \frac{F_u(e)}{F_v(e)}$$

we mean the product over all edges $u \xrightarrow{e} v$ in γ. Then we see that

$$\frac{s^* J_A}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G} = \frac{R\langle V_0 \rangle}{\langle V_0 \left(1 - \prod_\gamma \frac{F_u(e)}{F_v(e)}\right) : \gamma \text{ from } v_0 \text{ to } v_0 \rangle}$$

(in particular we see that $\frac{s^* J_A}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G}$ is cyclic as an R-module). Then the canonical closed immersion Supp $\frac{s^* J_A}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G} \to S$ is an isomorphism if and only if the annihilator of $\frac{s^* J_A}{\sum \mathbb{K}_G}$ is zero, if and only if for every path γ as above we have $1 - \prod_\gamma \frac{F_u(e)}{F_v(e)} = 0$, which (by a simple combinatorial argument) is equivalent to the 'matching up condition' (1). □

Finally, we show how to reconstruct a compactified enriched structure from a supp-compatible vertex enrichment datum.

Lemma 8.6. *Suppose S is local, and $(q_G \colon s^* \mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{L}_G)_{(v,G)}$ is a supp-compatible invertible vertex enrichment datum. Let H be a hemisphere of Γ. Let A be the unique circuit-connected component of Γ which contains all separating edges of H. Then there exists a unique short exact sequence*

$$0 \to \mathbb{K}_H \to s^* \mathcal{J}_H \to \mathcal{O}_S(S) \to 0$$

so that the natural map

$$\frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_A}{\sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(A)} \mathbb{K}_G} \to \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_A}{(\sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(A)} \mathbb{K}_G) + \mathbb{K}_H}$$

is an isomorphism. Moreover the corresponding quotient of $s^* \mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ is invertible (under the correspondance of lemma 7.1).

Note that in this argument it only matters that the labels of edges in A vanish on S - this will be important in lemma 8.10.

Proof. Noting above that $s^* J_A / \sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(A)} \mathbb{K}_G$ is cyclic, the A-supp-compatibility condition implies that $s^* J_A / \sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(A)} \mathbb{K}_G \cong R$. Then we have a natural map

$$\varphi \colon s^* \mathcal{J}_H \to \frac{s^* \mathcal{J}_A}{\sum_{(v,G) \in \pi(A)} \mathbb{K}_G} \cong R,$$

and we see from the presentations in the proof of lemma 8.5 that it is a surjection, hence the kernel K_φ is free of rank $\#e(H, H^c) - 1$ as an R-module.

In order for the compatibility to hold we must choose $\mathbb{K}_H$ to be contained in K_φ, and we must have that $\mathbb{K}_H$ is free of rank $\#e(H, H^c) - 1$ as an R-module. Since also the cokernel of $\mathbb{K}_H \to s^*\mathcal{J}_H$ is free of rank 1 we see that the only option is to have $\mathbb{K}_H = K_\varphi$.

It remains to check the invertibility of the corresponding quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$. If we construct $F_H(e) \in R$ for $e \in A$ in an analogous fashion to the construction of the $F_G(e)$ for (v, G) relative components as above, then invertibility is equivalent to all the $F_H(e)$ being units in R. Perhaps the nicest way to see that they are indeed units is to give a direct recipe to build $F_H(e)$ out of the $F_G(e)$. First, scale the $F_G(e)$ so that they match up (cf. (2) of lemma 8.3). Then if $e\colon u - v$ is an edge in A with $v \in H$ and $u \in H^c$, then we define $F_H(e) = F_v(e) = F_u(e)$. That the $F_H(e)$ so defined are in $R^\times$ is immediate. A small calculation is then required to check that (under the duality as in lemma 8.4) these $F_H(e)$ really correspond to the $\mathbb{K}_H$ defined above, yielding the invertibility. □

Lemma 8.7. *Let $\mathfrak{E}$ be an invertible enrichment datum which is A-supp-compatible for every circuit-connected component A. Then $\mathfrak{E}$ is compatible.*

Proof. This is immediate from the following two claims:
Claim 1: Let A be a circuit-conneced component, and $B \subseteq A$ a non-empty subset. Then natural map $s^*\mathcal{J}_B \to s^*\mathcal{J}_A$ induces a surjection

$$\frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_B}{\sum_{e(H,H^c)\subseteq B} \mathbb{K}_H} \to \frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_A}{\sum_{e(H,H^c)\subseteq A} \mathbb{K}_H}.$$

Proof of claim 1: That there is an induced map is clear since the $\mathbb{K}_H$ we consider for B are a subset of the ones we consider for A. The surjectivity follows from the presentation of $\frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_A}{\sum_H \mathbb{K}_H}$ given in the proof of lemma 8.5. This concludes the proof of claim 1.
Claim 2: Let A, A' be two distinct (hence disjoint) circuit-connected components. Let $B \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq A'$. Then the natural isomorphism $s^*\mathcal{J}_B \oplus s^*\mathcal{J}_{B'} \to s^*\mathcal{J}_{B\cup B'}$ induces an isomorphism

$$\frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_B}{\sum_{e(H,H^c)\subseteq B} \mathbb{K}_H} \oplus \frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_{B'}}{\sum_{e(H,H^c)\subseteq B'} \mathbb{K}_H} \xrightarrow{\sim} \frac{s^*\mathcal{J}_{B\cup B'}}{\sum_{e(H,H^c)\subseteq B\cup B'} \mathbb{K}_H}.$$

Proof of claim 2: Because B and B' are contained in distinct circuit-connected components, the $\mathbb{K}_H$ appearing for $B \cup B'$ are exactly the union of those appearing for B and those appearing for B'. This concludes the proof of the second claim, and thus the lemma. □

Theorem 8.8. *Suppose we are in Situation 6.5. Suppose moreover that all the labels on all edges in Γ are zero. Suppose also that S is local.*

1. *If we start with a compatible invertible enrichment datum $\mathfrak{E}$ (i.e. an invertible compactified enriched structure) then the invertible supp-compatible vertex-enriched structure $\mathfrak{E}_{vert}$ obtained by forgetting extra quotients is $\otimes$-compatible;*

2. *The resulting functor from invertible compactified enriched structures to enriched structures is an equivalence.*

Proof. (1): By lemma 8.5, there exists a scaling of the trivialisations which matches up, and then by lemma 8.3 the invertible vertex-enrichment datum is $\otimes$-compatible.

(2): If we start with an enriched structure, we immediately have an invertible vertex enrichment datum (they consist of the same data!). By lemma 8.3 and lemma 8.5 the invertible vertex enrichment datum is A-supp-compatible for every circuit-connected component A. Then by lemma 8.6 there is a unique way to extend it to an invertible enrichment datum which is A-supp-compatible for every circuit-connected component A. Finally by lemma 8.7 this invertible enrichment datum is actually compatible. □

8.2 Integral base schemes

Lemma 8.9. *Let C/S be σ-simple-controlled, and assume that there exists an invertible enrichment datum on C/S. Then C/S is 1-aligned.*

Proof. A trivial modification of the proof of lemma 2.28 - note that the proof of that lemma never used the condition that the tensor product of the invertible sheaves be trivial, only the existence of an invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$. □

Lemma 8.10. *Suppose we are in Situation 6.5 and are given a subset of an enrichment datum which contains a vertex enrichment datum. Fix a hemisphere H, and suppose all labels of all separating edges of H vanish on S. All separating edges of H are contained in some circuit-connected-component, say A. Suppose that our given subset of an enrichment datum is A-supp-compatible. Then there is a unique invertible quotient of $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ which is A-supp-compatible with all the other given quotients.*

Proof. This is a slight generalisation of lemma 8.6, and the same proof works. The main difference is that here we only assume the labels of edges in A vanish on S (rather than all edges as in lemma 8.6), but this is not important for the proof. □

Corollary 8.11. *Suppose we are in Situation 6.5. Suppose moreover that S is* reduced. *Then the conclusions of theorem 8.8 hold; more precisely, we have*

1. *If we start with a compatible invertible enrichment datum $\mathfrak{E}$ (i.e. an invertible compactified enriched structure) then the invertible supp-compatible vertex-enriched structure $\mathfrak{E}_{vert}$ obtained by forgetting extra quotients is $\otimes$-compatible;*

2. *Suppose also that every connected component of S is irreducible. Then the resulting functor from invertible compactified enriched structures to enriched structures is an equivalence.*

Proof. (1): Suppose that C/S is as in the statement and that we are given a compatible invertible enrichment datum. We extract a vertex-enrichment datum $(q_{v,G}\colon s^*\mathcal{I}_{G^c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathscr{F}_{v,G})_{v,G}$, and consider the line bundle $\bigotimes \mathscr{F}_{v,G}$. The locus in S where this bundle is trivial on the fibres is a closed subscheme of S and contains all points of S by theorem 8.8 (applies in the case when the base is a point), hence is equal to S since S is reduced.

(2): Unlike for (1) we cannot quite deduce this formally from the case over a field. Note that both sets are empty if C/S is not 1-aligned by lemma 8.9, so we may assume that C/S is 1-aligned. Fix a hemisphere H of Γ. Let $z\colon Z_H \rightarrowtail S$ be the closed subscheme where all the labels of separating edges of H vanish. We consider two cases:
Case 1: The map z is a surjection. Then we are essentially in the case we considered before (all relevant labels vanishing on S), and we are done by lemma 8.10.
Case 2: The map z is not a surjection. By alignment, Z_H is cut out by monogenic ideal, and since z is not a surjection we see that Z_H is a Cartier divisor in S (i.e. cut out by a regular element). Then $s^*\mathcal{I}_{H^c}$ is invertible, so we take $K_H = 0$ and compatibility is clear. □

8.3 Deducing the general case

Recall that $\mathcal{E}/\mathcal{M}$ is the stack of enriched structures, and write $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}/\mathcal{M}$ for the stack of invertible compactified enriched structures - this is evidently an open substack of the stack $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ of compactified enriched structures. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is regular we know by corollary 8.11 that $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{E}) = \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}(\mathcal{E})$, and the former contains the identity, so we obtain a map $\Psi\colon \mathcal{E} \to \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$.

Theorem 8.12. *The map $\Psi\colon \mathcal{E} \to \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. We may assume $\mathcal{M}$ is an irreducible scheme. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is irreducible, so the same holds for $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}$ is a point then the map $\Psi_m\colon \mathcal{E}_m \to \bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}_m$ is an isomorphism by theorem 8.8. In particular, Ψ is a bijection on points. If $\mathcal{M}^0 \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ denotes the (dense open) locus of smooth curves then $\mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{M}$ is an isomorphism over $\mathcal{M}^0$, and the same is true for $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv} \to \mathcal{M}^0$. Moreover the pullback of $\mathcal{M}^0$ to

$\mathcal{E}$ is dense in $\mathcal{E}$, so its image in $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$ is dense there also. Thus we see that the map Ψ is a birational map of integral schemes, and that $\mathcal{E}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$ have the same dimension.

If p is a point of $\mathcal{E}$ lying over a point $m \in \mathcal{M}$, then by theorem 8.8 we have an isomorphism of tangent spaces

$$T_p\mathcal{E}_m \xrightarrow{\sim} T_{\Psi(p)}\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}_m.$$

The dimension of the former (and hence the latter) tangent space is computed in proposition 5.8. Moreover, the image in $T_m\mathcal{M}$ of $T_{\Psi(p)}\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$ satisfies the same upper bound as that obtained for $T_p\mathcal{E}$ in lemma 5.5, since $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv} \to \mathcal{M}$ is 1-aligned by lemma 8.9. Thus repeating the computation of proposition 5.8 (and using that $\mathcal{E}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$ are irreducible schemes of the same dimension) we see that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}^{inv}$ is regular.

Thus we see that Ψ is a birational bijection between regular schemes, so by [Sta13, Lemma 0AB1] it is an isomorphism. □

A Defining sheaves on a base for a Grothendieck topology

This appendix contains the abstract results which allow us to define a sheaf by specifying its values on a full subcategory.

Definition A.1 (Sheaf with respect to a coverage)**.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category. A *coverage* K on $\mathcal{C}$ is an assignment $A \mapsto K(A)$ for each object A of $\mathcal{C}$, where $K(A)$ is a collection of families of morphisms to A, such that if $\{f_i \colon A_i \to A\} \in K(A)$ and $g \colon A' \to A$ is any morphism in $\mathcal{C}$, then there is a family $\{f'_j \colon A'_j \to A'\} \in K(A')$ such that each $g \circ f'_j \colon A'_j \to A$ factors via some f_i.

The families $\{f_i \colon A_i \to A\} \in K(A)$ are called *covering families* and the pair $(\mathcal{C}, K)$ is called a *site*. A *sheaf* on $(\mathcal{C}, K)$ is a presheaf $\mathcal{F} \colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathbf{Set}$ such that for each covering family $\{A_i \to A\}$ in K, the restriction map $\mathcal{F}(A) \to \prod_i \mathcal{F}(A_i)$ is injective with image the set of those tuples $(a_i)_i$ such that, for every commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \longrightarrow & A_i \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A_j & \longrightarrow & A, \end{array}$$

the common restrictions of a_i and a_j to B agree. The category of presheaves on $\mathcal{C}$ will be denoted below as $\mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$, and given a coverage K on $\mathcal{C}$, we denote by $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, K)$ the full subcategory of $\mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$ consisting of sheaves on $(\mathcal{C}, K)$.

Definition A.2 (Grothendieck pretopology)**.** If $\mathcal{C}$ has pullbacks, we say that a coverage on $\mathcal{C}$ is a *Grothendieck pretopology* if it satisfies the following three extra conditions:

1. (Compatibility with pullback.) For each covering family $\{A_i \to A\}$ and each morphism $A' \to A$ in $\mathcal{C}$, the pullback family $\{A' \times_A A_i \to A'\}$ is also a covering family.

2. (Reflexivity.) For each object A of $\mathcal{C}$, the singleton family $\{\mathrm{id}_A \colon A \to A\}$ is a covering family.

3. (Transitivity.) If $\{A_i \to A\}$ is a covering family, and for each i we have another covering family $\{A_{ij} \to A_i\}$, then the family of all composites $\{A_{ij} \to A_i \to A\}$ is also a covering family.

If K is a Grothendieck pretopology on $\mathcal{C}$, then a presheaf $\mathcal{F} \colon \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathbf{Set}$ is in $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, K)$ if and only if for each covering family $\{A_i \to A\}$ in K, the usual diagram

$$\mathcal{F}(A) \to \prod_i \mathcal{F}(A_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{F}(A_i \times_A A_j)$$

is an equalizer.

Definition A.3 (Base for a coverage)**.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category equipped with a coverage, and let $\mathcal{B}$ be a full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$. We say $\mathcal{B}$ is *a base for* $\mathcal{C}$ if every object in $\mathcal{C}$ admits a cover by objects in $\mathcal{B}$.

Lemma A.4 (Comparison Lemma)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category with pullbacks, and let K be a Grothendieck pretopology on $\mathcal{C}$ making every representable presheaf a sheaf (i.e. the topology is subcanonical). Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a base for $(\mathcal{C}, K)$. Then*

1. *The assignment $K|_{\mathcal{B}} \colon A \mapsto K(A) \cap \mathcal{B}$, sending an object of $\mathcal{B}$ to the collection of covers of it by more objects of $\mathcal{B}$, is a coverage on $\mathcal{B}$.*

2. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a presheaf on $\mathcal{B}$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is a sheaf on $(\mathcal{B}, K|_{\mathcal{B}})$ if and only if for every cover $\{A_i \to A\}_{i \in I}$ in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$, and for every family of covers $\{A_{ijk} \to A_i \times_A A_j\}_{k \in I_{ij}}$ of the fibered products $A_i \times_A A_j \in \mathcal{C}$ by objects in $\mathcal{B}$, the diagram*

$$\mathcal{F}(A) \to \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}(A_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{\substack{i,j \in I \\ k \in I_{ij}}} \mathcal{F}(A_{ijk}) \tag{17}$$

   is an equalizer.

3. *The restriction functor $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is an equivalence $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, K) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{B}, K|_{\mathcal{B}})$.*

Thus a presheaf on $\mathcal{B}$ extends (uniquely) to a sheaf on $(\mathcal{C}, K)$ if and only if diagram (17) is an equalizer for all such A, A_i, and A_{ijk}.

Proof.

1. Let $\{A_i \to A\}_{i \in I}$ be a family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}(A)$ and $g\colon A' \to A$ any morphism in $\mathcal{B}$. We must exhibit a covering of A' in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ such that each composite morphism to A factors via some $A_i \to A$.

   First form the pullback family $\{A' \times_A A_i \to A'\}_{i \in I}$ in $\mathcal{C}$, and for each i choose a cover of $A' \times_A A_i$ by objects $\{A'_{ij}\}_{j \in I_i}$ of $\mathcal{B}$. Then because K is a Grothendiek pretopology, the family of all composites $\{A'_{ij} \to A' \otimes_A A_i \to A'\}_{i \in I, j \in I_i}$ is also in K, and in fact in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$. Furthermore, each composite $A'_{ij} \to A' \to A$ factors canonically via $A_i \to A$, as desired. Thus $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a coverage.

2. Let $\{A_i \to A\}_{i \in I}$ be a cover in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$, and for each $i, j \in I$, let $\{A_{ijk} \to A_i \times_A A_j\}_{k \in I_{ij}}$ be a cover by objects in $\mathcal{B}$; we must show that a tuple $(a_i)_i \in \prod_i \mathcal{F}(A_i)$ has the same two images in $\prod_{i,j,k} \mathcal{F}(A_{ijk})$ if and only if for every commutative square formed by an object $B \in \mathcal{B}$ with morphisms to some A_i and A_j, the two restrictions $a_i|_B$ and $a_j|_B$ agree. Then the sheaf condition for $\mathcal{F}$ is exactly the same as diagram (17) being an equalizer.

   The "if" direction is easy, since composing the map $A_{ijk} \to A_i \times_A A_j$ with the projections to A_i and A_j make the square with A commute. For the "only if" direction, let $(a_i)_i$ be a tuple such that for all $i, j \in I$ and $k \in I_{ij}$, we have $a_i|_{A_{ijk}} = a_j|_{A_{ijk}}$, and let $A_i \leftarrow B \to A_j$ be a span of objects in $\mathcal{B}$ over A. We will show that $a_i|_B = a_j|_B$.

   In $\mathcal{C}$, the maps $B \to A_i$ and $B \to A_j$ give a single morphism $B \to A_i \times_A A_j$, and we can therefore form the pullback covering family $\{B \times_{(A_i \times_A A_j)} A_{ijk} \to B\}_{k \in I_{ij}}$ in $\mathcal{C}$. For each $k \in I_{ij}$, let $\{B_{ijk\ell} \to B \times_{(A_i \times_A A_j)} A_{ijk}\}_{\ell \in I_{ijk}}$ be a cover of the fibered product in $\mathcal{C}$ by objects of $\mathcal{B}$. Then by transitivity, $\{B_{ijk\ell} \to B\}_{k \in I_{ij}, \ell \in I_{ijk}}$ is a covering family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$. Thus $\mathcal{F}(B) \to \prod_{i,j,k,\ell} \mathcal{F}(B_{ijk\ell})$ is injective, so it suffices to show that the restrictions of a_i and a_j to each $B_{ijk\ell}$ agree. But this is true, because the morphisms from $B_{ijk\ell}$ to A_i and A_j factor through A_{ijk}, where we are assuming a_i and a_j agree.

3. For this part, we appeal to a similar result, Corollary A.4.3 in [MLM94]; this is why we have the subcanonicality hypothesis. All we need to do is translate their result in the sieve language into our covering family language; this amounts to checking that if S is a sieve on $B \in \mathcal{B}$—i.e. a collection of morphisms to B closed under precomposition by any composable morphism in $\mathcal{B}$—then S contains a covering family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ if and only if the collection

(S) of all morphisms to $B \in \mathcal{C}$ factoring via some morphism in S contains a covering family in K.

The "only if" direction is trivial: such a covering family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is also the desired covering family in K. Now suppose that (S) contains a K-covering family $\{A_i \to B\}_{i \in I} \subset \mathcal{C}$. This means that each $A_i \to B$ factors via some $B_i \to B$ in S. Now choose for each A_i a cover $\{B_{ij} \to A_i\}_{j \in I_i}$ by objects in $\mathcal{B}$. Then by transitivity and the sieve condition on S, the composite family $\{B_i j \to B\}_{i \in I, j \in I_i}$ is a covering family in $K|_{\mathcal{B}}$ contained in S, as desired. □

Remark A.5. Lemma A.4(3) only says that a sheaf on $\mathcal{B}$ extends uniquely (up to unique natural isomorphism) to a sheaf on $\mathcal{C}$, but in fact we can compute $\mathcal{F}(A)$ from $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{B}}$ for any object $A \in \mathcal{C}$. First, choose covering families $\{A_i \to A\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{A_{ijk} \to A_i \times_A A_j\}_{k \in I_{ij}}$ with all A_i and A_{ijk} in $\mathcal{B}$. Then lemma A.4(2) tells us (by applying the case $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$) that diagram (17) is an equalizer, and if $\mathcal{F}|_{\mathcal{B}}$ is known then this gives a way to calculate $\mathcal{F}(A)$.

Example A.6. As a simple example, we obtain the well-known fact that a presheaf on the category of schemes is a sheaf in the étale topology if and only if it is a Zariski sheaf and satisfies descent for each étale cover of one affine scheme by another. For if we apply lemma A.4 to the full subcategory **Aff** of affine schemes, we find that sheaves on the big Zariski site correspond to presheaves on **Aff** that satisfy the sheaf condition with respect to open covers. Sheaves on the big étale site correspond to those presheaves on **Aff** that satisfy the sheaf condition with respect to open covers and étale surjections. Thus to check that a presheaf on the big étale site is a sheaf, it suffices to check that it is a Zariski sheaf (thus corresponding to a Zariski sheaf on **Aff**) and satisfies descent for affine étale surjections (so that it corresponds to an étale sheaf on **Aff**).

References

[AK80] Allen Altman and Steven Kleiman. Compactifying the Picard scheme. *Adv. in Math.*, 35(1):50–112, 1980.

[AP14] Alex Abreu and Marco Pacini. Enriched curves and their tropical counterpart. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.5308, to appear in Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 2014.

[Cap08] Lucia Caporaso. Néron models and compactified Picard schemes over the moduli stack of stable curves. *Amer. J. Math.*, 130(1):1–47, 2008.

[CMW12] Renzo Cavalieri, Steffen Marcus, and Jonathan Wise. Polynomial families of tautological classes on. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 216(4):950–981, 2012.

[DM69] Pierre Deligne and David Mumford. The irreducibility of the space of curves of given genus. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (36):75–109, 1969.

[D'S79] Cyril D'Souza. Compactification of generalised Jacobians. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Sect. A Math. Sci.*, 88(5):419–457, 1979.

[EM02] Eduardo Esteves and Nivaldo Medeiros. Limit canonical systems on curves with two components. *Invent. Math.*, 149(2):267–338, 2002.

[ES07] Eduardo Esteves and Parham Salehyan. Limit Weierstrass points on nodal reducible curves. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(10):5035–5056, 2007.

[Est01] Eduardo Esteves. Compactifying the relative Jacobian over families of reduced curves. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(8):3045–3095 (electronic), 2001.

[Fal96] Gerd Faltings. Moduli-stacks for bundles on semistable curves. *Math. Ann.*, 304(3):489–515, 1996.

[Fer03] Daniel Ferrand. Conducteur, descente et pincement. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 131(4):553–585, 2003.

[FGI+05] B. Fantechi, L. Göttsche, L. Illusie, S. L. Kleiman, N. Nitsure, and A. Vistoli. *Fundamental algebraic geometry*, volume 123 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005. Grothendieck's FGA explained.

[FTT16] Edward Frenkel, Constantin Teleman, and A. J. Tolland. Gromov-Witten gauge theory. *Adv. Math.*, 288:201–239, 2016.

[GZ14] Samuel Grushevsky and Dmitry Zakharov. The zero section of the universal semiabelian variety, and the double ramification cycle. *Duke Math J.*, 163(5):889–1070, 2014.

[Hai13] Richard Hain. Normal functions and the geometry of moduli spaces of curves. In G. Farkas and I. Morrison, editors, *Handbook of Moduli, Volume I. Advanced Lectures in Mathematics, Volume XXIV*. International Press, Boston, 2013.

[Hol14] David Holmes. A Néron model of the universal jacobian. *http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.2243*, 2014.

[Hol16a] David Holmes. Néron models of jacobians over base schemes of dimension greater than 1. *To appear in J. Reine Angew. Math.* , *http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/crll.ahead-of-print/crelle-2016-0014/crelle-2016-0014.xml* , 2016.

[Hol16b] David Holmes. Quasi-compactness of Néron models, and an application to torsion points. *To appear in Manuscripta Math.*, *http://arxiv.org/abs/1604.01155* , 2016.

[JPPZ16] F Janda, R Pandharipande, A Pixton, and D Zvonkine. Double ramification cycles on the moduli spaces of curves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.04705*, 2016.

[Liu02] Qing Liu. *Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves*, volume 6 of *Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002. Translated from the French by Reinie Erné, Oxford Science Publications.

[Mai98] Laila Maino. *Moduli space of enriched stable curves*. PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1998.

[MLM94] Saunders Mac Lane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in geometry and logic*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. A first introduction to topos theory, Corrected reprint of the 1992 edition.

[MM64] David Mumford and A. Mayer. Further comments on boundary points. *Unpublished lecture notes distributed at the Amer. Math. Soc. Cummer Institute, Woods Hole*, 1964.

[MW13] Steffen Marcus and Jonathan Wise. Stable maps to rational curves and the relative jacobian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1310.5981*, 2013.

[Ore14] Giulio Orecchia. Torsion free rank 1 sheaves on a semi-stable curve. *Master's thesis*, *https://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/scripties/MasterOrecchia.pdf* , 2014.

[Oss14a] Brian Osserman. Dimension counts for limit linear series on curves not of compact type. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.5450*, 2014.

[Oss14b] Brian Osserman. Limit linear series for curves not of compact type. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.6699*, 2014.

[Sta13] The Stacks Project Authors. Stacks project. `http://stacks.math.columbia.edu`, 2013.